



- (51) International Patent Classification:  
G06F 17/30 (2006.01)
- (21) International Application Number:  
PCT/US2014/072202
- (22) International Filing Date:  
23 December 2014 (23.12.2014)
- (25) Filing Language: English
- (26) Publication Language: English
- (30) Priority Data:  
61/921,592 30 December 2013 (30.12.2013) US
- (71) Applicant: THE DUN & BRADSTREET CORPORATION [US/US]; 103 JFK Parkway, Short Hills, NJ 07078 (US).
- (72) Inventors: SCRIFFIGNANO, Anthony, J.; 37 Woodrow Place, West Caldwell, NJ 07006 (US). SPINGARN, David, A.; 36 Radtke Road, Randolph, NJ 07869 (US). RIZZOLO, Barry; 251 Sylvia Lane, Allentown, PA 18104 (US). DAVIES, Robin; 5001 Lower Macungie Road, Macungie, PA 18062 (US). YOUNG, Michael, R.; 751 Harrison Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18015 (US). SHIMMER, Laurie; 121 Iron Wold Road, Stewartville, NJ 08836 (US). NICODEMO, John, Mark; 11 Tulip Court, Edison, NJ 08820 (US).

(74) Agent: GREELEY, Paul, D.; Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle LLP, One Landmark Square, 10th Floor, Stamford, CT 06901 (US).

(81) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of national protection available): AE, AG, AL, AM, AO, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BH, BN, BR, BW, BY, BZ, CA, CH, CL, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DO, DZ, EC, EE, EG, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, GT, HN, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IR, IS, JP, KE, KG, KN, KP, KR, KZ, LA, LC, LK, LR, LS, LU, LY, MA, MD, ME, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MY, MZ, NA, NG, NI, NO, NZ, OM, PA, PE, PG, PH, PL, PT, QA, RO, RS, RU, RW, SA, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, SM, ST, SV, SY, TH, TJ, TM, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, ZA, ZM, ZW.

(84) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of regional protection available): ARIPO (BW, GH, GM, KE, LR, LS, MW, MZ, NA, RW, SD, SL, ST, SZ, TZ, UG, ZM, ZW), Eurasian (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, RU, TJ, TM), European (AL, AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, HR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LT, LU, LV, MC, MK, MT, NL, NO, PL, PT, RO, RS, SE, SI, SK, SM, TR), OAPI (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GQ, GW, KM, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).

Declarations under Rule 4.17:

— of inventorship (Rule 4.17(iv))

[Continued on next page]

(54) Title: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL RECURSIVE LEARNING PROCESS AND SYSTEM USED TO DISCOVER COMPLEX DYADIC OR MULTIPLE COUNTERPARTY RELATIONSHIPS





FIG. 12B

(57) Abstract: A multidimensional recursive and self-perfecting process used to discover dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between parties, the process comprising: (a) collecting information from a plurality of data sources; (b) discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between the parties from the collected information; (c) clustering the parties to infer the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between the parties based on common or partially intersecting attributes between the parties, thereby forming clustered parties; (d) evaluating the clustered parties for business linkage potential by integrating the collected information and contextually assessing indicia from the data sources to detect and measure consistency and inconsistency for a given party or dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship; (e) positing and evaluating relationship type and role said party plays in each relationship; and (f) assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between the parties.



- *as to non-prejudicial disclosures or exceptions to lack of novelty (Rule 4.17(v))*
- Published:**
- *with international search report (Art. 21(3))*

**A MULTIDIMENSIONAL RECURSIVE LEARNING PROCESS AND  
SYSTEM USED TO DISCOVER COMPLEX DYADIC OR MULTIPLE  
COUNTERPARTY RELATIONSHIPS**

5

**BACKGROUND****1. Field**

The present disclosure generally relates to a system and process for  
10 discovery, curation, adjudication and synthesis of complex dyadic and multiple  
counterparty global (that is, intra- and inter-jurisdictional and cross-border)  
business relationships. In particular, the disclosure relates to the creation of a  
system capable of discovering, qualifying, and recording dyadic and multi-  
counterparty relationships between business entities (hereinafter referred to as  
15 “business linkages”). The process comprises source-agnostic and non-  
deterministic analytic sub-processes which transform, measure, critically  
evaluate, adjudicate and refactor using clustering and affinity-recognition  
routines, which feed into self-improvement routines, so that the process and  
system functions as a highly recursive system that posits, tests, implements and  
20 monitors new strategies for the identification, confirmation, and maintenance of  
business linkages.

**2. Discussion of the Background Art**

The overall problem is to understand comprehensive relationships among  
25 business counter-parties. Typically, such understanding is applied to use cases  
involving total risk or total opportunity. Such understanding can also apply to  
more complex use cases, such as predictive analytics, remediation and scenario  
formulation.

30 Prior art for determination of the relationships, as exemplified in Fig. 6,  
attached hereto, include solutions which group entities having the same name

together, but they are limited to use of only the name to trigger adjudication of the similarity and potential relationship. The technical problem is that such solutions do not provide effective automated and evolving curation capabilities and/or the ability to triangulate on a relationship by considering it from the perspective of multiple sources or indicia, some of which may be identified through analytic techniques. Also, such solutions typically either lack a manual curation and adjudication option, or perform their automated tasks with insufficient precision and accuracy to effectively filter potential relationships and ensure efficient use of the correct manual adjudication resources and processes. Without sufficient filtering or precision, potential relationships go through manual adjudication using a single “one size fits all” approach. The result is either a lack of reproducibility and difficulty driving economies of scale, for solutions with manual adjudication options, or for solutions without manual adjudication options, inconsistent, poor accuracy insufficient for all but the least critical business applications.

The technical effect of the present disclosure overcomes the disadvantages of conventional corporate linkage systems and processes by using a combination of (a) automated, recursive, and manual curation, (b) rules-based adjudication of sources and source combinations, and (c) multiple alternative indicia, to accurately determine the interrelationship context of business entities. Automated rules are leveraged against historical experiences and representative samples, results are thoroughly evaluated to determine “truth”, and rule improvement and tuning enables creation of a refined set of rules maximizing automation to enable scalability, while allowing for targeted and “most fitting” manual curation and adjudication strategies to be utilized as necessary.

Results assessment and tuning exploit detailed heuristic and analytic techniques, and include both established and emerging knowledge as well as learning algorithms and other approaches for adjudication of heterogeneous and highly dynamic, often unstructured data.

By supporting recursive testing and refinement of automation rules, and customization to optimize performance and minimize manual efforts, the present system maximizes effectiveness and the ability to leverage an increasing number of sources over time to widely expand scope without significantly increasing manual efforts, while continuing to accurately determine contextual relationships.

The present disclosure leverages logic to uniquely identify business entities through a robust identity resolution process, as a foundation upon which to evaluate context.

The present disclosure generates batch and transactional interactions, having either standardized, dynamic, and/or proprietary formats, enabling interaction with human resources who further adjudicate and evaluate the indicia to determine context.

The present disclosure also generates batch and transactional interactions, having either standardized, dynamic and/or proprietary formats, to synthesize updates and persist contextual insight.

Sources and processes are used to both establish and maintain contextual insight, by monitoring status, detecting active and passive change and initiating curation and adjudication as necessary.

The present disclosure precisely tracks results, and reporting tools are used to evaluate veracity and best-use of sources for tuning and diagnostic purposes, and self-learning features to improve performance based on experience. Reporting tools are also used to assess progress against known opportunities.

Manual discovery, curation and adjudication is performed by human resources having the best fit of experience and ability, based on complexity level, with rule based decisions routing to the resources.

The present disclosure also provides many additional advantages, which shall become apparent as described below.

### **SUMMARY**

5           A multidimensional recursive process used to discover dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between parties, the process comprising: (a) collecting information from a plurality of data sources; (b) discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between the parties from the collected information; (c) clustering the parties to infer the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships  
10 between the parties based on common or partially intersecting attributes between the parties, thereby forming clustered parties; (d) evaluating the clustered parties for business linkage potential by integrating the collected information and contextually assessing indicia from the data sources to detect and measure consistency and inconsistency for a given party or dyadic or multi-counterparty  
15 relationship; (e) positing the roles played and/or direction of the relationship, by identifying the party most likely to be superior, such as headquarters or parent, .and (f) assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists, and is of the posited relationship type and direction between the parties.

20

The process further comprises the step of leveraging self-learning to improve the ability of the multidimensional recursive process to evaluate and/or assess potential that the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between the parties. The step of leveraging self-learning is at least one selected from the  
25 group consisting of: (a) using seed rules posited for evaluating the potential that the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between the parties; (b) applying applicable candidates from the currently known corpus of rules to the collected information to evaluate the clusters of the parties for quantity, quality and/or character of relationships discovered; (c) using detailed truth  
30 determination to leverage expertise and additional information to assess truth about potential relationships in the clustered parties; (d) learning which of the

seed rules and the plurality of sources are most useful in determining that the dyatic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between the parties, (e) continuously assessing the veracity of each of the plurality of sources, and (f) leveraging experience to discover and posit adjudication rules proposing additional indicia, new rules or enhancement to the seed rules.

The process further comprises the step of continuously curating the adjudication rules, wherein the process leverages experience gained through the detailed truth determination to tune, improve and/or adjust the seed rules used for evaluating the potential that the dyatic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between the parties.

The process further comprises the step of using identity resolution to establish and reference identifiers for discovering dyatic or multi-counterparty relationships between parties external to the process.

The clustering of the parties is based on a flexible range of indicia. The indicia is at least one selected from the group consisting of: behavioral data, names, inception characteristics, size, and industry.

The common or partially intersecting attributes are at least one attribute selected from the group consisting of: Internet presence details, account or other external identifier, name similarity, address, secondary address, related individual, on behalf of relationships, and knowledge, opinion, or hypothesized relationships.

The step of assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that the dyatic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between the parties and is based upon rules related to prior experience with similar data points for other parties and potential relationships, including the veracity of the source from which the data points were discovered. In addition, attributed proximity as a

function of shared indicia across geographic or geo-political intervals, may be used as input to curation and adjudication

Furthermore, step (f) improves the processes ability to assess potential  
5 and existing relationships and whether they (i) should automatically qualify to become business linkages, (ii) require more collection of information and evaluation of the clustered parties for business linkage potential, or (iii) are insufficiently likely to exist and warrant no further active attention.

10 Preferably, collecting information involves discovery of at least one selected from the group consisting of: identifying new sources of the information, evaluating the quality of the source, understanding changes in the data environment, and developing new technologies and processes for identification of appropriate data.

15

Another embodiment is a system that comprises: a processor; and a memory that contains instructions that are readable by the processor, and that when read by the processor cause the processor to perform actions of:

- a. collecting information from a plurality of data sources;
- 20 b. discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between the parties from the collected information;
- c. clustering the parties to infer the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between the parties based on common or partially intersecting attributes between the parties, thereby forming  
25 clustered parties;
- d. evaluating the clustered parties for business linkage potential by integrating the collected information and contextually assessing indicia from the data sources to detect and measure consistency and inconsistency for a given party or dyadic or multi-counterparty  
30 relationship;

- e. considering attributed proximity as a function of shared indicia across geographic or geo-political intervals, as an input to curation and adjudication; and
- f. assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between the parties.

Further objects, features and advantages of the present disclosure will be understood by reference to the following drawings and detailed description.

#### **BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS**

Fig. 1 is a block diagram representing the three primary steps of discovery, curation and synthesis used in the present disclosure.

Fig. 2 depicts the system as a set of inter-related activities leveraging automation and recursion to sustainably drive quality according to the present disclosure.

Fig. 3 depicts a source which reveals existence of an “on behalf of” relationship between two entities, such that this “on behalf of” relationship can serve as a discovery source.

Figs. 4a-4k are diagrammatic representations of the recursive learning process according to the present disclosure.

Fig. 5 is a block diagram depicting a computer system which implements the processes of the present disclosure.

Fig. 6 is a schematic diagram of a conventional corporate linkage process.

Fig. 7 is a block diagram of the discovery step according to the present disclosure.

Fig. 8 is a logic diagram of account number or other indicia clustering and  
5 initial curation processes according the present disclosure.

Fig. 9a is a process flow diagram which illustrates by example the discovery and account number clustering steps according to the present disclosure.

10 Fig. 9b is a process flow diagram which illustrates by example the discovery and name clustering steps according to the present disclosure.

Fig. 9c is a process flow diagram which illustrates by example the discovery and name clustering showing a scenario where other entities are similar  
15 and thus warrant the formation of a cluster.

Fig. 9d is a process flow diagram which illustrates by example the discovery and name clustering showing a scenario where no other entities are sufficiently similar to create a cluster with more than one member.  
20

Figs. 10a and b are process flow diagrams of the curation and synthesis steps for candidate records according to the present disclosure.

Fig. 11 is a block diagram depicting how similar extant entities are  
25 clustered based on behavioral or previously persisted data attributes according to the present disclosure.

Figs. 12a through 12c are process flow diagrams illustrating how rules driven processing continuously improves through self-learning according to the  
30 present disclosure.

### **DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENT**

This system and process effectuates evaluation and correlation of multiple sources to Discover relationships and potential relationships (based on common data attributes, services, or behavior), Curate (accumulate, store, maintain, and update), and Adjudicate (evaluate and act upon) those relationships vs. previously discovered insight about the involved counterparties and their relationships, drive recursive collection of additional information as needed, and create consistently classified and actionable information globally.

The present disclosure can best be understood by referring to the figures, wherein Figs. 1 and 2 is a block diagram representing the three primary steps of discovery 1, curation 3 and synthesis 5 used in the present disclosure.

Fig. 2 depicts the recursive process leveraging automation to sustainably drive quality according to the present disclosure, wherein discovery step 1 involves third party business-to-business (B2B) relationships, discovered relationships, e.g., clustering, web and discoverable content, etc. To enhance discovery step 1, it is helpful to provide a direct channel for customer feedback, gold sources, e.g., linkage on self, and leverage existing best practices. Curation 3 includes source correlation analytics, insight advanced rules, and targeted resolution. Curation also includes feedback to discovery 1 to initiate collection of additional information as necessary. This recursive curation process allows for continuous refinement of rules, drives consistent quality, drives scale, allows for adjudication of sources and profiling them according to quality and character of content, and allows for ongoing monitoring of source capabilities. Finally, synthesis step 5 adds new linkages and verifies linkages. Synthesis is also sometimes used to refer to the process of initiating additional Discovery steps, such as by generating input to Discovery processes.

30

**Discovery:**

The present disclosure leverages a variety of sources to Discover relationships between entities. For example, it will group records having a common account number or identifier. Business Identity attributes of the entity records are associated with existing known entities, or may be used to justify reflection of a new entity in master database. Once the identity is resolved for each of the entities involved in a group or cluster of counterparties, the group of counterparties, referred to as “entities” because they have been associated with maintained persistent keys, is evaluated to assess the potential relationships among them.

**Curation and Adjudication:**

Scenarios vary depending on whether contextual relationships have been previously determined and persisted for all, some, or none of the members of the associated group. Where relationships have previously persisted, the receipt of new source information is used to confirm existing status, or to detect potential changes (conflicts). Conflicts are raised for further adjudication, while confirmations are used to maintain freshness assessments in a master database.

Where a given entity has not been previously determined to exist in the associated context of a group of other entities, potential relationships are identified to associate it with other members of its group, using rules to determine the most likely association. This aggregation may include the assumption that a member already known to provide context to other group members is most likely to provide similar context to the entity of focus. Attributes such as geographic proximity and similarity of business activities are some of the indicia which may be used to automatically adjudicate potential relationships.

Once the best or most likely relationship is identified for a particular entity, the veracity of the source(s) and performance of various indicia are used to determine whether the context can be automatically established, or whether the

observation requires further Discovery or Adjudication. Also, prior experience of this same system in determining presence or absence of linkage based on the same values of same indicia may be used to guide curation of currently considered relationships. Simultaneously, incremental knowledge is augmented  
5 regarding the cumulative performance of particular sources and for the stratification of various sub-aggregations of sources according to observed performance. If further Discovery and Manual Adjudication are necessary, the best fitting type of resource & workflow is identified, a task is created (Synthesis) as per the required interface, and the actions are initiated.

10

Manual discovery, curation and adjudication is performed by several types of resources including low experience for simplified and granular work tasks, moderate experience specialists, and finally individuals who are domain experts. Work tasks may consist of resolution of a pair of entities, or of sets of  
15 entities.

Results of any Discovery and Manual Adjudication are tracked and assessed as inputs to the automated curation and adjudication rules, which look to synthesize additions and updates to the master database, or additional tasks for  
20 further Discovery and Adjudication.

**Discovery Source:**

Fig. 3 depicts a type of source which may be used to discover business-to-business relationships. In this example, one entity on a record may perform some  
25 service or provide assurance on behalf of the other entity. The existence of an “on behalf of” relationship reveals the existent dyadic relationship, which may then be curated and adjudicated to determine appropriate next steps. Depending on the source, source veracity, ability to correlate other relationship discovery sources, and available data points, decisions can be made to automatically accept  
30 as a specific linkage and type, gather additional data points using a chosen approach, reject, or defer pending spontaneous discovery of additional data

points. Paying bills or acting as guarantor on behalf of another entity can imply ownership, e.g., North Vision Enterprises may own Zelda Agency or RGX Investments may own The Chronicle.

5 Figs. 4a-4k are diagrammatic representations of the recursive learning process according to the present disclosure. The present disclosure relates to the creation of a new system which discovers and records dyadic and multi-counterparty relationships between business entities (hereafter “business linkages”). The present disclosure is comprised of source-agnostic and non-deterministic analytic sub-processes which transform, measure, critically  
10 evaluate, adjudicate and refactor using clustering and affinity-recognition routines, which feed into self-improvement routines, so that the Present disclosure as a whole functions as a highly recursive system that posits, tests and implements new strategies for the identification, confirmation, and maintenance  
15 of business linkages.

The present disclosure is able to be configured including per Source Profile (2.0) to draw inputs from multiple sources in Information Discovery (3.0) and discover potential business linkages between two or more entities. It does  
20 this recursively, sometimes consuming a source *in toto* in order to deduce business linkages from the undifferentiated data, other times adopting a directed, inductive approach to pursue information about specific business entities. It may also collect indicia values from two or more sources for various entities, then infer relationships based on aggregating that knowledge. The present disclosure  
25 leverages Identity Resolution (5.0) capabilities to resolve identities of the entities and enable recognition of the entity from multiple perspectives, and integration of those perspectives. Independently of Identity Resolution, the present disclosure identifies and where applicable implements specialized, novel techniques to cluster (6.1) business entities together, based on the information discovered  
30 above.

The present disclosure exploits known and previously qualified relationships among the business entities currently under consideration, as well as among previously considered entities. It exploits additional attributes about all the entities as well. The integrated data is continually Evaluated (6.2, 6.3) to determine whether each potential relationship is sufficiently understood to qualify for addition to the corpus of known business linkages. Other outcomes of the evaluation are (a) recognition of a deficiency or “gap” in data and therefore a need to Initiate Additional Information Discovery (7.1), (b) deferment of action pending passive receipt of more corroborative data and capture of this Assessment (4.5), (c) determination of opportunities to modify or Initiate Additional Information Discovery (7.1) to justify modification of existing business linkage when conflicts are identified, and / or (d) determination of opportunities to confirm consistent existing business linkage and maintain its Assessment (4.5).

15

**Key features include:**

- Information Discovery and Curation: The system iteratively leverages Information Discovery (3.0) to collect, and Integrate Discovered Information (4.3) which may be predictive of relationships and business linkage.
- Leverages Identity Resolution (5.0) to establish and reference identifiers for discovered entities external to the system, including but not limited to organizations, individuals, and conceptual entities such as financial instruments. Identity Resolution enables consistent references over the course of time, and the system may use any identity resolution strategies available to it (including recent ones around Individuals).
- Cluster Entities based on a flexible range of indicia (5.7) including but not limited to behavioral data, names, inception characteristics, size, and industry, as a source to Information Discovery of potential relationships,

20

25

leveraging Identity Resolution to infer potential relationships for further Evaluation (6.0).

- Clustering (6.1) entities to infer relationships based on common or partially intersecting attributes such as:

- 5           a. Internet presence details
  - b. Account or other external identifier
  - c. Name Similarity
  - d. Address
  - e. Secondary Address (mailing address)
  - 10           f. Related individual
  - g. “On behalf of” relationships
  - h. Knowledge, opinion, or hypothesized relationships, whether internally or externally sourced
- Evaluation (6.0) of clusters for Linkage potential, by Integrating  
15       Discovered Information (4.3) and contextually assessing potential and existing relationships (6.3) by balancing indicia from the sourced data against each other, and against previously confirmed information about the subject entities and potential relationships. This includes correlating multiple sources and indicia above to detect and measure consistency and  
20       inconsistency for a given entity or relationship. It also includes assessment of entity perimeters (6.3) to determine Merge (5.6) opportunities. It also includes profiling of indicia values or partial values to consider level of dispersion across various populations or denominators, such as industry, size of extant family, classification,  
25       shared supplier relationships, or other contextual factors.
  - Assessing (6.3) the confidence level regarding the likelihood that the posited relationship exists and that the nature of the relationship is of a

qualifying type (as not all relationships are actionable), using rules based inter alia upon the present disclosure's prior experience with similar data points for other entities and potential relationships.

- Leveraging self-learning to become more effective and efficient over time:
  - i. System accepts "seed rules" posited for evaluating potential relationships
  - j. The present disclosure applies applicable candidates from the currently known corpus of rules to the accumulated and integrated information to Evaluate Clusters for Quantity, Quality, and Character of relationships revealed (6.2)
  - k. Detailed Truth Determination (3.3) leverages expertise and additional Information Discovery to assess truth about the relationships in clusters of various categories
  - l. Continuously curate adjudication rules - learning which rules and sources most useful and for which relationship and entity variations (6.6).
  - m. Veracity of sources is assessed continuously and tracked to support evolution of rules, including "Truthiness" assessment (9.2), Usefulness assessments per business categories (9.4). Interaction synergies are measured and prioritization of sources is adjusted and tracked through Source precedence weight (9.3), and Effectiveness of intersecting sources (9.5). Predictiveness of specific values of indicia are assessed and tracked, and provide input to future curation of clusters based on same indicia values.
  - n. The system leverages experience to Discover and Posit New Adjudication Rules (8.3) proposing additional indicia, new rules or enhancement to the current rule set, to improve ability to Assess Potential and Existing Relationships (6.3) and whether they:

- i. Should automatically qualify to become business linkage
  - ii. Require more Information Discovery (3.0) and Evaluation (6.0), and initiates such steps
  - iii. Are insufficiently likely to exist and warrant no further active attention
- 5
- Continuously Curate Adjudication Rules (6.6): Leverage experience to mature evaluation rules. For example, when two or more sources predict relationships for the same business entity, and their conclusions about related entities are contradictory, the Present disclosure leverages experience gained through Detailed Truth Determination (3.3) to tune, Improve and Adjust the Evaluation Rules (6.7) used to interpret the potential relationships. When similar raw information is available from both sources, the outcome of additional discovery is used to adjust the rules used to interpret information within the source whose conclusion was originally less accurate.
- 10
- In addition to maturing the understanding of relationships not already established as business linkage, the same information is used to Assess Existing Relationships (6.3) previously accepted as business linkage. Where the independently discovered information supports and confirms the linkages as they exist, the freshness and confidence of those relationships is maintained in their Assessment (4.5). Where the information contradicts existing linkages, it is used to Initiate Additional Information Discovery (7.1) for additional data points to determine the current state of the relationship and either confirm or correct it if necessary.
- 15
- In addition to maturing understanding of newly discovered relationships, and assessing previously synthesized relationships, the system tracks potential relationships previously adjudicated and determined to not exist,
- 20
- 25

thus building knowledge not only of known relationships, but also where a relationship of a certain type does not exist.

FIG. 5 is a block diagram of a system 600 for employment of the present disclosure. System 600 includes a computer 605 coupled to a network 3930, e.g., the Internet.

Computer 605 includes a user interface 610, a processor 615, and a memory 620. Computer 605 may be implemented on a general-purpose microcomputer. Although computer 605 is represented herein as a standalone device, it is not limited to such, but instead can be coupled to other devices (not shown) via network 630.

Processor 615 is configured of logic circuitry that responds to and executes instructions.

Memory 620 stores data and instructions for controlling the operation of processor 615. Memory 620 may be implemented in a random access memory (RAM), a hard drive, a read only memory (ROM), or a combination thereof. One of the components of memory 620 is a program module 625.

Program module 625 contains instructions for controlling processor 615 to execute the methods described herein. For example, as a result of execution of program module 625, processor 615 perform the actions of: (a) collecting information from a plurality of data sources; (b) discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between the parties from the collected information; (c) clustering the parties to infer the dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between the parties based on common or partially intersecting attributes between the parties, thereby forming clustered parties; (d) evaluating the clustered parties for business linkage potential by integrating the collected information and contextually assessing indicia from the data sources to detect and measure

consistency and inconsistency for a given party or dyatic or multi-counterparty relationship; and (e) assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that the dyatic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between the parties.

5           The term "module" is used herein to denote a functional operation that may be embodied either as a stand-alone component or as an integrated configuration of a plurality of sub-ordinate components. Thus, program module 625 may be implemented as a single module or as a plurality of modules that operate in cooperation with one another. Moreover, although program module  
10 625 is described herein as being installed in memory 620, and therefore being implemented in software, it could be implemented in any hardware (e.g., electronic circuitry), firmware, software, paper, or a combination thereof.

          User interface 610 includes an input device, such as a keyboard or speech  
15 recognition subsystem, for enabling a user to communicate information and command selections to processor 615. User interface 610 also includes an output device, such as a paper, display or a printer. A cursor control, such as, but not limited to, a mouse, track-ball, or joy stick, allows the user to manipulate a cursor on the display for communicating additional information and command selections  
20 to processor 615.

          Processor 615 outputs, to user interface 610, a result of an execution of the methods described herein. Alternatively, processor 615 could direct the output to a remote device (not shown) via network or paper 630.

25           While program module 625 is indicated as already loaded into memory 620, it may be configured on a storage medium 635 for subsequent loading into memory 620. Storage medium 635 can be any storage medium that stores program module 625 thereon in tangible form. Examples of storage medium 635 include, but not limited to, a floppy disk, a compact disk, a magnetic tape, a read only memory, an  
30 optical storage media, universal serial bus (USB) flash drive, a digital versatile disc, or a zip drive. Alternatively, storage medium 635 can be, but not limited to, a

random access memory, or other type of electronic storage, located on a remote storage system and coupled to computer 605 via network 630.

Fig. 7 is a block diagram of the discovery step according to the present disclosure, wherein third party knowledge or information 70 is discovered and collected 71 from customer or third party file of accounts, including account numbers with entity names and addresses. The process then undertakes the step of identity resolution 72, wherein entity names and addresses are compared to known entities, mapped to existing identifiers or to newly recognized entities and their identifiers as needed. The identity resolution results are then stored in database 74. Thereafter, the process adds, updates or confirms attributes for each entity, such as account number per specific source 73 and stores in relationship building information database 75. Databases used by the system are represented logically and may actually be created and maintained as a single database.

Fig. 8 is a logic diagram of account number clustering and initial curation processes according the present disclosure. This diagram demonstrates the recursive nature of the clustering, curation and adjudication processes. Step B is shown as a reference point only as a waypoint in the recursion process, not as a first step in a sequential process. Curation and adjudication decisions made during prior processing have updated the relationship building information database 75. The same relationship building information database 75 is used in discovery step 81 and in other processes, such as Curation and Adjudication. Discovered information from step 81 is processed in step 83 together with source profiles and performance information 85 by grouping records having the same indicia value or partial value into clusters and thereafter each cluster is evaluated 87. Thereafter, the process determines if the cluster contains more than one (1) record 89. If it does not contain more than 1 record then no action is taken 91. However, if it does contain more than 1 record, then each record in a cluster is evaluated 93. If a record in a cluster is not already linked 95 to a record in a linkage reference database 97, then the process identifies and evaluates the most likely relationship 99. If already linked, then the process determines if the

existing linkage is consistent with the cluster content 101. If not consistent, then the process attempts to resolve any conflicting information 103. If consistent, then the process determines if source veracity is sufficient for linkage confirmation 105. If not sufficient, then update (B) the relationship building information database 75 to reflect the decision to not use this discovered information to confirm the existent business linkage. If sufficient, then confirm existing linkage (A), tracking metadata, e.g., date and source, 107 in the linkage reference database 97, and update (B) the relationship building information database 75 reflect the decision to use this discovered information to confirm the existent business linkage.

Fig. 9a is a process flow diagram of the discovery and account clustering steps according to the present disclosure, wherein an example of various entities are discovered 201 with respective account numbers, followed by identity resolution 203 wherein a corporate identifier is assigned to the entity based upon the name of entity, street address, or other identity attributes. The entities are clustered if they have the same indicia value such as, partial account number 12345 (205) or account number 2299-X (207).

Fig. 9b is a process flow diagram of the discovery and name clustering steps according to the present disclosure, wherein known existing entities are reviewed for similarities across attributes 303, and entities having sufficiently similar attributes, such as business name, trade style, location, phone, or other identifier, are clustered based upon those similarities 305.

Fig. 9c is a process flow diagram of the discovery and name clustering showing a scenario where other entities are similar and thus warrant the formation of a cluster.

Fig. 9d is a process flow diagram of the discovery and name clustering showing a scenario where no other entities are sufficiently similar to create a cluster with more than one member.

5 Figs. 10a and b depict the process flow of the curation and synthesis steps according to the present disclosure which occurs after discovery and clustering for unlinked records. Identify and evaluate most likely relationship for unlinked records 99 by postulating relationships based on attributes and/or known or previously postulated relationships for focus entity and other cluster members  
10 103. Retain or store discovered potential relationships in relationship building information database 75. For each postulated relationship, evaluate confidence and synthesize actions 401, correlate with previously posited relationships for same entity 403, derive attribute similarity scores for cluster members to each other 405, and consider veracity (prior performance and truthiness of source(s))  
15 407. Thereafter, consider prior performance of specific value of indicia used to infer relationship 409, and decide and initiate synthesis action 411. Thereafter, launch discovery or investigation task 413, await receipt of additional information 417 and/or auto link (i.e. generate database transactions) 415 and forward to linkage reference database 97.

20

Fig. 11 is a block diagram depicting how similar entities are clustered based on behavioral or previously persisted data attributes according to the present disclosure, wherein entity and linkage reference database 501 is used to identify seed entities 503 which may be then evaluated by identity resolution 505  
25 processes to seek similar, yet distinct entities and cluster each original seed entity with those other entities determined to be similar 509. Entity clusters 509 are then stored in entity and relationship building information database 511 so they may be curated.

30 Figs. 12a through 12c are process flow diagrams illustrating how rules driven processing continuously improves through self-learning according to the

present disclosure. Fig. 12a shows the recursive nature of the core process. Fig. 12b adds interactions to support tracking and assessment of performance to support self-learning. Finally, Fig. 12c hides most of the core process interactions to better highlight the feedback flows of tracking and assessment driving self-learning to impact the way the rules will control the process in improved ways as the system matures based on experience.

In Fig. 12a, discovery and collection of information 701, identity resolution 703, grouping and clustering of entities 705, automated evaluation of potential linkages 707, and investigative testing of potential linkages 709 all interact via the relationship building information database 511 to identify potential relationships and evaluate them. The processes are controlled by Rules and Cumulative Source Performance Information. Depending on decisions taken, additional Discovery may be initiated 701 to fulfill unmet needs and drive recursion for additional discovery and curation. Alternatively, if a potential relationship is approved or rejected, add and maintain linkages and lack of linkages 711 in the Entity and Linkage Reference database 501.

Figs. 12b helps to explain the unique self-learning of the present disclosure, wherein continuous capture and analysis of results drive self-learning. Analytics techniques 801 are applied to analyze data accumulated in the Entity and relationship building information database 511, with the objective of gaining insight into opportunities to refine the rules used to Discover, Curate, and Adjudicate relationships. The type of data analyzed may include, but is not limited to, which sources and indicia were used to discover potential relationships, how it compares with other sources for relationship information on the same entity or entities, and the outcome of investigative testing of such relationships for the focus and other entities. This may reveal insights, such as that a particular indicia when received from a particular discovery source is highly predictive of approved business linkage. Such an observation is then leveraged to refine the rules governing the future adjudication of relationships

discovered via that source and indicia. Analytic techniques 801 then posit new and adjusted rules for discovery and curation in Rules and Cumulative Source Performance Information database 713. Some of the data used by both Analytic Techniques 801, and leveraged by Rules established and matured with the Rules & Cumulative Source Performance Information database 713 is collected as feedback from observed metadata violations during discovery and collection of information 701, source quality observations (i.e. macro and micro levels) from investigative testing of potential linkages 709, automated evaluation of potential linkages 707, discovered evaluation rules and adjustments, and human expertise and heuristics observed during investigative testing of Potential Linkages 709 and analysis of such results. The updated rules and cumulative source performance information in database 713 continues to control processes, such as discovery and collection of information 701, group/cluster entities 705, identity resolution 703, and automated evaluation of potential linkages 707, but does so with improved performance outcomes due to the learnings generated based on the feedback flows described above.

Fig. 12c helps to highlight the self-learning aspect of Fig. 12b, but showing only a limited portion of the normal core process flows, while retaining the feedback interactions (designated by consistently dashed lines in the diagrams), and retaining the rules interactions controlling the core processes (designated by mixed dashed/dotted lines in the diagrams).

While we have shown and described several embodiments in accordance with our invention, it is to be clearly understood that the same may be susceptible to numerous changes apparent to one skilled in the art. Therefore, we do not wish to be limited to the details shown and described but intend to show all changes and modifications that come within the scope of the appended claims.

**WHAT IS CLAIMED IS:**

1. A multidimensional recursive process used to discover dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between parties, said process comprising:
  - a. collecting information from a plurality of data sources;
  - 5 b. discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between said parties from said collected information;
  - c. clustering said parties to infer said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between said parties based on common or partially intersecting attributes between said parties, thereby forming  
10 clustered parties;
  - d. evaluating said clustered parties for business linkage potential by integrating said collected information and contextually assessing indicia from said data sources to detect and measure consistency and inconsistency for a given party or dyadic or multi-counterparty  
15 relationship;
  - e. positing and evaluating relationship type and role said party plays in each relationship; and
  - f. assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said  
20 parties.
2. The process according to claim 1, further comprising the step of leveraging self-learning to improve the ability of said multidimensional recursive process to evaluate and/or assess potential that said dyadic or  
25 multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties.
3. The process according to claim 2, wherein said step of leveraging self-learning is at least one selected from the group consisting of: (a) using seed rules posited for evaluating the potential that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties; (b) applying  
30 applicable candidates from the currently known corpus of rules to said

collected information to evaluate said clusters of said parties for quantity, quality and/or character of relationships discovered; (c) using detailed truth determination to leverage expertise and additional information to assess truth about potential relationships in said clustered parties; (d) learning which said seed rules and said plurality of sources are most useful in determining that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties, (e) continuously assessing the veracity of each of said plurality of sources, and (f) leveraging experience to discover and posit adjudication rules proposing additional indicia, new rules or enhancement to said seed rules.

4. The process according to claim 3, further comprising the step of continuously curating said adjudication rules, wherein said process leverages experience gained through said detailed truth determination to tune, improve and/or adjust said seed rules used for evaluating the potential that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties.
5. The process according to claim 1, further comprising the step of using identity resolution to establish and reference entity identifiers for discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between parties external to said process.
6. The process according to claim 1, wherein said clustering said parties is based on a flexible range of indicia.
7. The process according to claim 6, wherein said indicia is at least one selected from the group consisting of: behavioral data, names, inception characteristics, size, and industry.
8. The process according to claim 1, wherein said common or partially intersecting attributes are at least one attribute selected from the group

consisting of: Internet address details, account or other external identifier, name similarity, address, secondary address, common related individual, on behalf of relationships, and knowledge, opinion, or hypothesized relationships.

- 5
9. The process according to claim 1, wherein said step of assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties is based upon rules related to prior experience with similar data points for other parties and
- 10 potential relationships, and/or same data points for other parties and potential relationships.
10. The process according to claim 3, step (f) improves the processes ability to assess potential and existing relationships and whether they (i) should
- 15 automatically qualify to become said business linkage, (ii) require more collecting of said information and evaluating of said clustered parties for business linkage potential, or (iii) are insufficiently likely to exist and warrant no further active attention.
- 20 11. The process according to claim 1, wherein said collecting information involves discovery of at least one selected from the group consisting of: identifying new sources of said information, evaluating the quality of said source, understanding changes in the data environment, and developing new technologies and processes for identification of appropriate data.
- 25
12. A system comprising:
- a processor; and
- a memory that contains instructions that are readable by said processor, and that when read by said processor cause said processor to perform
- 30 actions of:
- a. collecting information from a plurality of data sources;

- b. discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between said parties from said collected information;
  - c. clustering said parties to infer said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between said parties based on common or partially intersecting attributes between said parties, thereby forming clustered parties;
  - d. evaluating said clustered parties for business linkage potential by integrating said collected information and contextually assessing indicia from said data sources to detect and measure consistency and inconsistency for a given party or dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship;
  - e. positing and evaluating relationship type and role said party plays in each relationship; and
  - f. assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties.
13. The system according to claim 12, further comprising the step of leveraging self-learning to improve the ability of said multidimensional recursive system to evaluate and/or assess potential that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties.
14. The system according to claim 13, wherein said step of leveraging self-learning is at least one selected from the group consisting of: (a) using seed rules posited for evaluating the potential that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties; (b) applying applicable candidates from the currently known corpus of rules to said collected information to evaluate said clusters of said parties for quantity, quality and/or character of relationships discovered; (c) using detailed truth determination to leverage expertise and additional information to assess truth about potential relationships in said clustered parties; (d)

learning which said seed rules and said plurality of sources are most useful in determining that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties, (e) continuously assessing the veracity of each of said plurality of sources, and (f) leveraging experience to discover and  
5 posit adjudication rules proposing additional indicia, new rules or enhancement to said seed rules.

15. The system according to claim 14, further comprising the step of continuously curating said adjudication rules, wherein said system  
10 leverages experience gained through said detailed truth determination to tune, improve and/or adjust said seed rules used for evaluating the potential that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties.

15 16. The system according to claim 12, further comprising the step of using identity resolution to establish and reference identifiers for discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between parties external to said system.

20 17. The system according to claim 12, wherein said clustering said parties is based on a flexible range of indicia.


18. The system according to claim 17, wherein said indicia is at least one selected from the group consisting of: behavioral data, names, inception  
25 characteristics, size, and industry.

19. The system according to claim 12, wherein said common or partially intersecting attributes are at least one attribute selected from the group consisting of: Internet presence details, account or other external  
30 identifier, name similarity, address, secondary address, related individual, on behalf of relationships, and knowledge, opinion, or hypothesized relationships.

20. The system according to claim 12, wherein said step of assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties is based upon rules  
5 related to prior experience with similar data points for other parties and potential relationships.
21. The system according to claim 12, wherein said step of assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties is based upon rules  
10 related to prior experience with same data points for other parties and potential relationships.
22. The system according to claim 14, step (f) improves the system's ability  
15 to assess potential and existing relationships and whether they (i) should automatically qualify to become said business linkage, (ii) require more collecting of said information and evaluating of said clustered parties for business linkage potential, or (iii) are insufficiently likely to exist and warrant no further active attention.
- 20 23. The system according to claim 12, wherein said collecting information involves discovery of at least one selected from the group consisting of: identifying new sources of said information, evaluating the quality of said source, understanding changes in the data environment, and developing  
25 new technologies and systems for identification of appropriate data.
24. A computer readable storage media containing executable computer program instructions which when executed cause a processing system to perform a method comprising:  
30 a. collecting information from a plurality of data sources;  
b. discovering dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between said parties from said collected information;


- c. clustering said parties to infer said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationships between said parties based on common or partially intersecting attributes between said parties, thereby forming clustered parties;
- 5 d. evaluating said clustered parties for business linkage potential by integrating said collected information and contextually assessing indicia from said data sources to detect and measure consistency and inconsistency for a given party or dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship;
- 10 e. positing and evaluating relationship type and role said party plays in each relationship; and
- f. assessing the confidence level regarding the likelihood that said dyadic or multi-counterparty relationship exists between said parties.

15



*FIG. 1*


We are creating a system which can be thought of as a recursive set of interrelated processes leveraging automation to sustainably drive quality



- Direct channel for customer feedback
- "Gold" source (e.g. linkage on self)
- Leverage existing best practices
- Recursive process allows for continuous refinement of rules
- Drive consistent quality
- Drive scale
- Allows for adjudication of sources and profiling them according to quality and character of content
- Allows for ongoing monitoring of source capabilities
- Add new
- Verify
- Modify

FIG. 2

“On behalf of “component leverages known business-to-Business relationships, other data and automated curation and adjudication to make consistent decisions.



- Source data implies a relationship
- Automated and/or manual curation determines next steps
- Outcomes include
  - Link-establish as specific or non-specific type of relationship
  - Merge /duplicate removal
  - Out of business

Name	Address	Name	Address
Zelda Agency	New York City, NY	North Vision Enterprises, LLC	Greenwich, CT
The Chronicle	San Diego, CA	RGX Investments	San Diego, CA

Paying bills or acting as guarantor on behalf of another entity can imply ownership

- North Vision enterprises may own Zelda Agency
- RG investments may own The Chronicle

**FIG. 3**





FIG. 4A




**FIG. 4B**





**FIG. 4C**




**FIG. 4D**

**FIG. 4E**


**FIG. 4F**



**FIG. 4G**



**FIG. 4H**

**FIG. 4I**



**FIG. 4J**

**FIG. 4K**




FIG. 5




FIG. 6 ( PRIOR ART )

Discovery - Account or other external identifiers




FIG. 7






FIG. 9A

Discovery & Clustering - Name  
Clustering example




FIG. 9B




FIG. 9C

Discovery & Clustering - Name  
Clustering example

Clusters: Entities having  
same or similar names




FIG. 9D






FIG. 10B

Name Clustering entities based on behavioral data




FIG. 11




FIG. 12A

Recursive Collection, Discovery, Clustering, and Curation, with self-learning




FIG. 12B

Self-learning drives continuous improvement of the rules which drive core system




FIG. 12C

**INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT**

International application No.

PCT/US2014/072202

<p><b>A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER</b>                  IPC(8) - G06F 17/30 (2015.01)                  CPC - G06Q 40/00 (2014.12)                  According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC</p>																	
<p><b>B. FIELDS SEARCHED</b></p> <p>Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)                  IPC(8) - G06F 17/30, 17/60, G06Q 40/00 (2015.01)                  USPC - 705/1, 35, 706/52</p> <p>Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched                  CPC - G06Q 40/00, 40/04, 40/06 (2014.12) (keyword delimited)</p> <p>Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practicable, search terms used)                  Orbit, Google Patents, Google                  Search terms used: recursive adjust said seed rules relationship roles counterparty</p>																	
<p><b>C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category*</th> <th>Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages</th> <th>Relevant to claim No.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>US 7,184,968 B2 (SHAPIRO et al) 27 February 2007 (27.02.2007) entire document</td> <td>1-24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>US 2002/0169658 A1 (ADLER) 14 November 2002 (14.11.2002) entire document</td> <td>1-24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>US 2005/0187866 A1 (LEE) 25 August 2005 (25.08.2005) entire document</td> <td>10 and 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>US 2005/0055266 A1 (FOTH et al) 10 March 2005 (10.03.2005) entire document</td> <td>1-24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.	Y	US 7,184,968 B2 (SHAPIRO et al) 27 February 2007 (27.02.2007) entire document	1-24	Y	US 2002/0169658 A1 (ADLER) 14 November 2002 (14.11.2002) entire document	1-24	Y	US 2005/0187866 A1 (LEE) 25 August 2005 (25.08.2005) entire document	10 and 22	A	US 2005/0055266 A1 (FOTH et al) 10 March 2005 (10.03.2005) entire document	1-24
Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.															
Y	US 7,184,968 B2 (SHAPIRO et al) 27 February 2007 (27.02.2007) entire document	1-24															
Y	US 2002/0169658 A1 (ADLER) 14 November 2002 (14.11.2002) entire document	1-24															
Y	US 2005/0187866 A1 (LEE) 25 August 2005 (25.08.2005) entire document	10 and 22															
A	US 2005/0055266 A1 (FOTH et al) 10 March 2005 (10.03.2005) entire document	1-24															
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Further documents are listed in the continuation of Box C. <input type="checkbox"/></p>																	
<p>* Special categories of cited documents:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>“A” document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance</td> <td>“T” later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td>“E” earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date</td> <td>“X” document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone</td> </tr> <tr> <td>“L” document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)</td> <td>“Y” document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art</td> </tr> <tr> <td>“O” document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means</td> <td>“&amp;” document member of the same patent family</td> </tr> <tr> <td>“P” document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			“A” document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance	“T” later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention	“E” earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date	“X” document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone	“L” document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)	“Y” document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art	“O” document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means	“&” document member of the same patent family	“P” document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed						
“A” document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance	“T” later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention																
“E” earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date	“X” document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone																
“L” document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)	“Y” document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art																
“O” document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means	“&” document member of the same patent family																
“P” document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed																	
<p>Date of the actual completion of the international search</p> <p>18 February 2015</p>		<p>Date of mailing of the international search report</p> <p><b>23 APR 2015</b></p>															
<p>Name and mailing address of the ISA/US</p> <p>Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US, Commissioner for Patents                  P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450                  Facsimile No. 571-273-3201</p>		<p>Authorized officer:</p> <p>Blaine R. Copenheaver</p> <p>PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300                  PCT OSP: 571-272-7774</p>															