

Codebook for the *Compendium of Federal Circuit Decisions* Document Dataset

Purpose of this Document: This document provides the coding framework for the document dataset from the *Compendium of Federal Circuit Decisions*, a complete collection of all documents publicly released by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“CAFC”) and Federal Circuit dockets from 1999 to the present. This codebook was developed during the data collection stage of this project to maximize replicability and reliability in the collected data. It is being provided so that future researchers will have the information necessary to replicate the *Compendium* and so that users of the *Compendium* who would like to know more about how the data was collected can easily access that information. The Codebook is a companion document to Jason Rantanen, *The Landscape of Modern Patent Appeals* (AMERICAN LAW REVIEW 2018).

Data Source and Collection: The CAFC posts opinions and a subset of orders to its website, currently located at www.cafc.uscourts.gov. As of spring 2021, the *Compendium* contains all documents released on the Federal Circuit’s website. Information about these documents is contained in a SQL database accessible through <https://empirical.law.uiowa.edu>. Data can be exported from the database in a customizable .csv file. Copies of the documents can be accessed on the Google Cloud Storage in the public cafc_documents bucket. Opinions of the CAFC are available back to 2004 and summary affirmances under Federal Circuit Rule 36 are available beginning in 2007. The degree to which the court has released other types of documents—particularly orders—has changed over time.

Date Range: The date ranges for the collection are October 13, 2004 – present.

Fields: Information about each document is recorded in the following fields.

uniqueID	
Description: Unique identifier assigned to each record.	
Format: XXXXX	Example: 10057
Notes: Each document is automatically assigned a record ID upon being added to the database. The record ID permits an individual record to be easily pulled up and all information about that record viewed at one time.	

documentDate	
Description: The date the document was released by the Federal Circuit.	
Format: [Year]-[Month]-[Date]	Example: 2010-03-01

documentDate
Notes: The documentDate is the date provided on the Federal Circuit’s website for the document, unless the document itself indicates a different date. This field was previously “caseDate” but was changed in 2021 to reduce confusion.

documentYear	
Description: Year document issued.	
Format: [Year]	Example: 2010
Notes: The year the document issued, based on truncated data from the Case Date. This field was previously “year” but was changed in 2021 to reduce confusion.	

origin	
Description: Court or tribunal of origin	
Format: [Court]	Example: DCT
Notes: The appeal’s general source origin. Default coding was populated based on the information provided on the Federal Circuit’s website, then reviewed and recoded by humans to conform to standardized entries and correct errors. Data is coded as follows:	
DCT	District Court
PTO	United States Patent and Trademark Office
CFC	Court of Federal Claims
CIT	Court of International Trade
CAVC	Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims. Includes term “CVA.”
MSPB	Merit Systems Protection Board
ITC	International Trade Commission
BCA	Board of Contract Appeals. Includes all boards of contract appeals, including the ASBCA (Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals)
OCBD	Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance
DVA	Department of Veterans Affairs

origin	
MISC	Miscellaneous. Includes origins that do not fit into other categories. Includes term “RIT,” which was a term used for writs of mandamus during 2009-2010.
DOJ	Department of Justice

caseName	
Description: Full case title and category	
Format: NAME [CATEGORY]	BARRON v. SCVNGR, INC. [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]
Notes: The full case title, based on information provided on the Federal Circuit’s website. Because this information is intended to be true to the court’s own website, it includes additional text to the extent it is on the website. For example, BARRON v. SCVNGR, INC. contains the additional text [RULE 36 JUDGMENT] as that is how the title appears on the court’s website.	

PrecedentialStatus	
Description: Indicates whether the document is precedential or nonprecedential.	
Format: [Status]	Example: Precedential
Notes: The precedential status of the document is based on information provided on the Federal Circuit’s website. It was previously named “Type.” Where identified, errors in the information provided by the Federal Circuit’s website have been corrected. Data is coded as follows:	
Precedential	Document is designated as precedential by the court.
Nonprecedential	Document is designated as not precedential by the court.

appealNumber	
Description: Appeal identification number	
Format: [xx]-[xxxx] or [xxxx]-[xxxx]	Example: 15-1202 or 2004-1291
Notes: The appeal number is based on the information provided on the Federal Circuit’s website. Note that a given document may have more than one appeal number. Note that this field only contains the appeal number provided on the court’s website and thus generally	

appealNumber
should not be used for research purposes. More detailed information the appeal numbers for each record is provided by the Appeal_Dockets field.

docType	
Description: Indicates document type.	
Format: [Type]	Example: Opinion
Notes: The document type is based on a review of the document. The following list provides additional description for the options for this field.	
Opinion	Document is identified as a judicial opinion.
Order	Document is identified as an order. Includes motion panel orders and Writs of Mandamus.
Rule 36	Document is identified as a summary affirmance under Federal Circuit Rule 36.
No File	There is no document associated with the entry on the Federal Circuit's website and no backup copy has been identified.
Errata	Document is self-described as an errata.
Other	Document does not fall into one of the above classifications. See notes field for further details.

enBanc	
Description: Identifies whether the opinion is en banc.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: The en banc status of a document is based on a review of the document. In rare situations, a document is en banc only in part. In these situations the document is coded as "Partial." Currently, most orders and errata are not coded for this field.	
Yes	Document is designated en banc in whole.
No	Document is not designated as en banc in whole or part.
Partial	Document is designated en banc in part.

enBanc	
#-judge	In extremely rare cases, a panel of more than three judges will hear an appeal. In these instances, the enBanc field reflects the number of judges that comprise the panel (for example, 11791 is a 5-judge panel).

judge1	
Description: Last name of first judge listed on document.	
Format: [Name]	Example: Prost
<p>Notes: The name of the first judge on the document is based on a review of the document itself. The order in which judges are listed on the document is the order in which they are entered into the database. If a panel has more than three judges, only the first three judges listed on the opinion are currently included in the database. If a document is coded “Yes” in the “En Banc” field, it is coded as “En Banc” for the “Judge 1” field. If a document is coded “Partial” in the “En Banc” field, the names of the three panel members are listed.</p> <p>Currently, most orders and errata are not coded for this field. Coders are instructed to only code this information for opinions and Rule 36 affirmances.</p>	

judge2	
Description: Last name of second judge listed on document.	
Format: [Name]	Example: Dyk
<p>Notes: The name of the second judge on the document is based on a review of the document itself. The order in which judges are listed on the document is the order in which they are entered into the database.</p> <p>See additional notes for the “Judge 1” field.</p>	

judge3	
Description: Last name of third judge on document.	
Format: [Name]	Example: Hughes

judge3
<p>Notes: The name of the third judge on the document is based on a review of the document itself. The order in which judges are listed on the document is the order in which they are entered into the database.</p> <p>See additional notes for the “Judge 1” field.</p>

opinion1	
<p>Description: Identifies whether or not the controlling opinion of the judges was unanimous or a majority.</p>	
<p>Format: [Agreement]</p>	<p>Example: Unanimous</p>
<p>Notes: The agreement of the panel is based on a review of the document. Unless the judges were unanimous in agreeing to the entirety of a written decision, the document should be coded as “Majority.” Summary affirmances under Federal Circuit Rule 36 are always coded as “Unanimous.” A document whose authorship is listed as “Per Curiam” but contains a separate opinion such as a concurrence or dissent is coded as “Majority.” A document that contains “additional views” of one of the judges is unanimous if all of the judges join in the court’s opinion.</p>	
<p>Unanimous</p>	<p>All judges on the decision join the decision in its entirety.</p>
<p>Majority</p>	<p>At least one judge does not join the decision in its entirety.</p>
<p>Note that “Opinion for the Court” does not mean that the opinion is necessarily unanimous. The opinion for the court may be, for example, a two-judge majority with another judge dissenting.</p>	

opinion1Author	
<p>Description: Last name of the author of the controlling opinion.</p>	
<p>Format: [Name]</p>	<p>Example: Hughes</p>
<p>Notes: The name of the author of the opinion is based on a review of the document itself. Decisions in which no judge is identified as the author of the opinion are recorded as “Per Curiam” unless the opinion itself indicates that the author of the judge is “Anonymous.” Authorship of Rule 36 summary affirmances is recorded as “Per Curiam.”</p>	

opinion2	
Description: Identifies the type of alternate opinion if the document contains one.	
Format: [Type]	Example: Dissenting
Notes: The type of alternate opinion is based on a review of the document. “Both” should be selected if the additional opinion in the document concurs-in-part and dissents-in-part. “Additional views” and “Dubitante” are self-identified in the document and are extremely rare.	
Dissenting	The second opinion is a written dissent or dissent-in-part.
Dissent Without separate opinion	The judge dissents or dissents-in-part without a separate written opinion.
Concurring	The second opinion is a concurrence or concurrence-in-part.
Concurrence-in-Result without opinion	The judge concurs or concurs-in-part without a separate written opinion.
Both	The second opinion concurs-in-part and dissents-in-part.
Additional Views	Opinion is self-identified as constituting “additional views.
Dubitante	Opinion is self-identified as being “dubitante.”

opinion2Author	
Description: Last name of the author of Opinion 2.	
Format: [Name]	Example: Hughes
Notes: The name of the author of Opinion 2 is based on a review of the document itself.	

opinion3	
Description: Identifies the type of alternate opinion if the document contains three separate opinions.	
Format: [Type]	Example: Dissenting
Notes: The type of alternate opinion is based on a review of the document. “Both” should be selected if the additional opinion in the document concurs-in-part and dissents-in-part. “Additional views” and “Dubitante” are self-identified in the document and are extremely rare.	

opinion3	
In the extremely rare instances where there are more than three distinct opinions in a document, the additional opinions are not currently recorded.	
Dissenting	The third opinion is a written dissent or dissent-in-part.
Dissent Without separate opinion	The judge dissents or dissents-in-part without a separate written opinion.
Concurring	The third opinion is a concurrence or concurrence-in-part.
Concurrence-in-Result without opinion	The judge concurs or concurs-in-part without a separate written opinion.
Both	The third opinion concurs-in-part and dissents-in-part.
Additional Views	Opinion is self-identified as constituting “additional views.
Dubitante	Opinion is self-identified as being “dubitante.”

opinion3Author	
Description: Last name of the author of Opinion 3.	
Format: [Name]	Example: Hughes
Notes: The name of the author of Opinion 3 is based on a review of the document itself.	

notes	
Description: Other comments on entry	
Format: [Text.]	
Notes: Notes are provided to flag unusual information about a document identified by a coder.	

url	
Description: Link to document on CAFC website.	
Format: [URL]	Example: http://www.cafc.uscourts.gov/images/stories/opinions-orders/11-1576.pdf

url	
Notes: Due to changes in the Federal Circuit's website, not all links currently work.	

FileName	
Description: File name for the document.	
Format: [filename.pdf]	Example: 03-1480.pdf
Notes: This is the original name of the file collected from the Federal Circuit's website. Because of issues with special characters in some Federal Circuit filenames, documents in the Compendium are stored using the NewFileName.	

TribOfOrigin	
Description: Identifies the specific tribunal that the appeal arises from. At present, only decisions (e.g.: opinions and Rule 36 affirmances) in appeals arising from the PATO and District Courts are coded for this field.	
Format: [Tribunal]	Example: N.D. IA
Notes:	
PTAB	Patent Trial and Appeal Board
BPAI	Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
TTAB	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

DisputeType	
Description: Identifies the general type of dispute. At present, only decisions in appeals arising from the BPAI, PTAB and District Courts are coded for this field.	
Format: [Type]	Example: IPR
Notes: For Rule 36 affirmances, it is necessary to look at the decision being appealed to determine the nature of the dispute. See Winborn coding memorandum for instructions on how to access these documents.	
IPR	Inter Partes Review (BPAI/PTAB only)

DisputeType	
DPA	Denial of patent application (BPAI/PTAB only)
CBMR	Covered Business Method Review (BPAI/PTAB only)
EPR	Ex Parte Reexamination (BPAI/PTAB only)
IPR	Inter Partes reexamination (BPAI/PTAB only)
PGR	Post Grant Review (BPAI/PTAB only)
Interference	Interference proceeding (BPAI/PTAB only)
Derivation	Derivation proceeding (BPAI/PTAB only)
Denial	Denial of a trademark application (TTAB only)
Opposition	Trademark Opposition proceeding (TTAB only)
Cancellation	Trademark Cancellation proceeding (TTAB only)
Patent infringement	Use this category for any appeals arising from a claim of patent infringement. For appeals arising from the district court, any appeal that involves patent validity is necessarily a patent infringement case. However, not all cases involving a patent that arise from the district courts are patent infringement cases. If the only issue being appealed to the Federal Circuit is a non-patent issue that was connected to a patent infringement claim under supplemental jurisdiction, that appeal should <u>not</u> be coded as patent infringement.
Denial of patent	This category applies when the cause of action in the district court involved the district court's review of the USPTO's refusal to grant a patent. (Appeals from District Court only.)
Other	This category applies when no other category is applicable.

DispGeneral	
Description: Identifies the appellate court's disposition of the appeal. At present, only decisions in appeals arising from the BPAI and PTAB are coded for this field. New documents should all be coded for this field.	
Format: [Disposition]	Example: Affirmed
Notes:	

DispGeneral	
Affirmed	Use this option only when the Federal Circuit affirms the decision being reviewed. Do not use if the Federal Circuit partially affirms.
Reversed	Use this option when the Federal Circuit reverses or reverses-and-vacates. Do not use if the Federal Circuit partially affirms.
Affirmed-in-part	Use this option for any instance in which the Federal Circuit affirms-in-part, including a decision that affirms-in-part, reverses-in-part or a decision that affirms-in-part, vacates-in-part.
Vacated	Use this option only when the Federal Circuit vacates the entirety of the decision being reviewed.
Dismissed	Use this option when the Federal Circuit dismisses the appeal.
Other	
Notes: In July 2021, the two permutations of “Affirmed-in-part” were merged into a single “Affirmed-in-part” value. Values previously coded as “other” were reviewed to determine whether they met the new value.	

Dissent	
Description: Identifies whether the document contains a dissent.	
Format: [Status]	Example: Yes
Notes: This field is automatically coded based on the coding in the Opinion2 and Opinion3 fields. A document that is coded Dissenting, Dissent without separate opinion, or Both in either Opinion2 or Opinion3 is coded “Yes” in this field. Currently this field is coded for opinions arising from the District Courts and USPTO.	
Yes	Document contains a dissent.
No	Document does not contain a dissent
[blank]	Dissent status has not yet been coded.

Concurrence	
Description: Identifies whether the document contains a concurrence.	

Concurrence	
Format: [Status]	Example: Yes
Notes: This field is automatically coded based on the coding in the Opinion2 and Opinion3 fields. A document that is coded Concurring, Concurrence-in-Result without separate opinion, or Both in either Opinion2 or Opinion3 is coded "Yes" in this field. Currently this field is coded for opinions arising from the District Courts and USPTO.	
Yes	Document contains a concurrence.
No	Document does not contain a concurrence
[blank]	Dissent status has not yet been coded.

CloudLink	
Description: Link to document on the cafc_documents Google Cloud storage site.	
Format: [String]	Example: https://storage.googleapis.com/cafc_documents/04-1291.doc
Notes:	

NewFileName	
Description: Replacement file name for the document.	
Format: [filename.pdf]	Example: 00203CAFCDocument.pdf
Notes: In order to better manage the documents used by the Compendium, each file has been renamed to use a consistent, simple file name. The NewFileName can also be used when conducting keyword searches on the text of documents in order to match the document up to the Compendium dataset.	

Appeal_Dockets	
Description: Identifies the appeal docket numbers involved in the appeal.	
Format: [String]	Example: 2004-01345

Appeal_Dockets	
Description: Identifies the appeal docket numbers involved in the appeal.	
<p>Notes: Individual appeal docket numbers should be separated by a semicolon. Appeal docket numbers should be standardized as follows: [YYYY-0ZZZZ]. Multiple appeal docket numbers should be entered as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2004-01345;2004-01346</p> <p>Until recently, Federal Circuit documents did not include the year in the miscellaneous docket number. (For example, 23820 just says “Miscellaneous Docket No. 899.”). For collection, these should contain the year that the document was published in (for example, 2009-00899).</p> <p>Add leading zeros if not otherwise present in order to make a 5-digit number after the hyphen.</p> <p>If the data coder is unable to determine the docket number for the document, this field should be left blank.</p>	

Orig_Trib_Docket	
Description: Identifies the docket number at the tribunal of origin for the appeal.	
Format: [Type]	Example: 1:02-CV-02042
<p>Notes: Individual original tribunal docket numbers should be separated by a semicolon. District Court appeal docket numbers should be standardized as follows: X:YY-CV-ZZZZZ. IF “X” is not known, then the docket number should be standardized as YY-CV-ZZZZZ. Appeals from the PTO and other tribunals should be left in the form that they are in on the document. Multiple tribunal of origin docket numbers should be entered as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1:02-CV-02042; 1:02-CV-02043</p> <p>If the data coder is unable to determine the docket number for the document, this field should be left blank.</p>	

n_Patents_in_Suit	
Description: Identifies how many patents in suit the decision involves.	
Format: [Number]	Example: 1

n_Patents_in_Suit
Description: Identifies how many patents in suit the decision involves.
Notes: Only patents actually at issue in the appeal should be counted. Patents involved at a lower tribunal decision, but not at issue in the appeal, should not be counted. Patent applications should not be counted.
If the coder is unable to determine how many patents-in-suit are involved in the decision, this field should be left blank.

Patents_in_Suit	
Description: Identifies the publication numbers for patents at issue in the appeal.	
Format: [Number]	Example: 7,934,433
Notes: Patent numbers should be coded as follows. Individual patent numbers should be separated by a semicolon.	
Utility Patent	X,XXX,XXX or XX,XXX,XXX
Design Patent	DXXX,XXX
Plant Patent	PXXX,XXX
Reissue patent	REXXX,XXX

Official_Cite	
Description: Identifies the official Federal Reporter citation for the document	
Format: [string]	Example: 123 F.3d 456
Notes: As of October 2020, this field is only populated for opinions and Rule 36 affirmances arising from the district courts.	

UtilityPatent
Description: Indicates whether at least one Patent_In_Suit is a utility patent.

UtilityPatent	
Format: [string]	Example: Yes
Notes: This field only contains an entry if the Patents_In_Suit field is populated. Note: as of October 2020, all patent application numbers and RE patents are coded as UtilityPatent=Yes.	

DesignPatent	
Description: Indicates whether at least one Patent_In_Suit is a design patent.	
Format: [string]	Example: Yes
Notes: This field only contains an entry if the Patents_In_Suit field is populated.	

PlantPatent	
Description: Indicates whether at least one Patent_In_Suit is a plant patent.	
Format: [string]	Example: Yes
Notes: This field only contains an entry if the Patents_In_Suit field is populated.	

Appellant_Type_Primary	
Description: Identifies the type of appellant in the primary appeal	
Format: [Appellant_Type]	Example: Patent asserter
Notes: This field is for coding the type of appellant for the primary appeal. Cross-appellants should be coded in the Appellant_Type_Cross field.	
Patent asserter	Use this category when the appellant is the party who asserted a patent in a patent infringement case at the district court
Accused infringer	Use this category when the appellant is the party accused of infringement at the district court
Patent applicant	Use this category when the appellant is a patent applicant.
Other	This category applies when no other category is applicable.

Appellant_Type_Cross	
Description: Identifies the type of cross-appellant.	
Format: [Appellant_Type]	Example: Patent asserter
Notes: This field is for coding the type of cross-appellant. Only code this field if there is a cross-appellant.	
Patent asserter	Use this category when the cross-appellant is the party who asserted a patent in a patent infringement case at the district court
Accused infringer	Use this category when the cross-appellant is the party accused of infringement at the district court
Patent applicant	Use this category when the cross-appellant is a patent applicant.
Other	This category applies when no other category is applicable.

Patent_Owner_Win	
Description: Identifies whether the party owning the patent prevailed on appeal	
Format: [Yes/No/Mixed/Unclear]	Example: Yes
Notes: This field is for coding whether the party owning the patent prevailed on appeal. This	
Yes	The patent owner clearly prevailed on appeal, such as by obtaining all the outcomes requested by the patent asserter.
No	The patent owner patent owner clearly lost on appeal, such as by an affirmance of all findings of invalidity or noninfringement.
Mixed	The patent owner won on some patent claims but lost on others. This does not include situations where the patent owner succeeded on, e.g., validity but lost on infringement.
Unclear	It is unclear whether the patent owner won or lost the appeal.

Issue Coding

General notes on issue coding:

- 1) Issue coding is one of the more challenging aspects of the Compendium as there are multiple gray areas. In general, coders are instructed to err on the side of inclusion in marginal cases. Particularly difficult determinations should be noted in the “notes” field.
- 2) Only issues explicitly or implicitly addressed by the Federal Circuit in its decision should be coded as “Yes.” For opinions, this means that if the Federal Circuit explicitly declines to address an issue because, for example, it affirms on an alternate ground, the issue it declines to address should be coded as “No.” In the case of Rule 36 affirmances, all issues raised by the appellant should be coded as “Yes.” Unless it is not possible to make a determination for a decision because, for example, the briefs for a Rule 36 affirmance are not available, the issue fields should be coded as “Yes” or “No.”
- 3) If the only issue on appeal is claim construction: and the court never addresses the substance of 102/103 and the applicant concedes the outcome under 102 or 103, then only claim construction should be coded as “yes.” 102/103 should be coded “no.” These appeals do not actually involve any substantial questions under 102 or 103.
- 4) If the only issue on appeal is whether the applicant is entitled to a filing date based on the adequacy of the earlier written description: both 102/103 and written description should be coded as “yes.”
- 5) If the issue on appeal is whether the earlier reference is adequately enabled for purposes of 102: both 102 and enablement should be coded as “yes.”

Utility	
Description: Identifies whether the utility of the patented invention was decided by the court. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Utility is a patent law doctrine based on 35 U.S.C. § 101	
Yes	The utility of at least one claimed invention was decided by the court.
No	The court did not address any utility issues.

PSM	
Description: Identifies whether the issue of patent eligible subject matter was decided by the court. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Patent eligible subject matter is a patent law doctrine based on 35 U.S.C. § 101	

PSM	
Yes	The issue of patent eligible subject matter was decided by the court for at least one claimed invention.
No	The court did not address any patent eligible subject matter issues.

Section 102	
Description: Identifies whether the court decided an issue involving 35 U.S.C. § 102. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Section 102 is often referred to as “anticipation” or “novelty”	
Yes	A § 102 issue for at least one claimed invention was decided by the court.
No	The court did not address any § 102 issues.

Issue_103	
Description: Identifies whether the court decided an issue involving 35 U.S.C. § 103. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Section 103 is often referred to as “obviousness” or “nonobviousness”	
Yes	A § 103 issue for at least one claimed invention was decided by the court.
No	The court did not address any § 103 issues.

Enablement	
Description: Identifies whether the court decided an issue involving the enablement doctrine. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Enablement is a patent law doctrine codified in 35 U.S.C. § 112.	
Yes	An enablement issue for at least one claimed invention was decided by the court.
No	The court did not address any enablement issues.

Written Description	
Description: Identifies whether the court decided an issue involving the written description doctrine. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Written description is a patent law doctrine codified in 35 U.S.C. § 112.	
Yes	A written description issue for at least one claimed invention was decided by the court.
No	The court did not address any written description issues.

Definiteness	
Description: Identifies whether the court decided an issue involving claim definiteness. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Claim definiteness is a patent law doctrine codified in 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is sometimes referred to as “indefiniteness”	
Yes	A claim definiteness issue for at least one claimed invention was decided by the court.
No	The court did not address any claim definiteness issues.

Obv Type Dbl Pting	
Description: Identifies whether the court decided an issue involving obviousness-type double patenting. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Obviousness-type double patenting is a patent law doctrine. It is distinct from the issue of obviousness.	
Yes	An obviousness-type double patenting issue for at least one claimed invention was decided by the court.
No	The court did not address any obviousness-type double patenting issues.

Claim_Construction	
Description: Identifies whether the court decided an issue involving claim construction. At present, this field is not coded.	
Format: [Status]	Example: No
Notes: Claim construction is a patent law doctrine that involves interpreting one or more portions of a patent claims.	
Yes	At least one claim construction issue was decided by the court.
No	The court did not address any claim construction issues.

Replaced	
Description: Identifies whether a decision was replaced by the court or was otherwise superceded. This includes opinions that are withdrawn and revised or corrected, appeals that are subsequently taken by the court sitting en banc, and appeals on which certiorari is granted by the Supreme Court.	
Format: [Yes, GVR, SCT, en banc, blank]	Example: GVR
Yes	Indicates that the panel replaced the decision with a new version. This includes subsequent "Corrected," "Modified," and "Revised" opinions. It also includes subsequent new opinions by the panel after granting panel rehearing. Only use "Yes" if it's a clear case that one of the documents was replaced in its entirety by the other.
SCT	Indicates that the Supreme Court subsequently granted certiorari and issued its own opinion in the appeal.
GVR	Indicates that the Supreme Court issued a grant-vacate-remand in the appeal. This means that the Court granted certiorari, but then immediately remanded to the Federal Circuit for further proceedings, usually in light of another decision by the Court.
En banc	Indicates that the Federal Circuit subsequently took the appeal en banc and issued its own opinion. If the Federal Circuit takes an opinion en banc, and then the panel subsequently issues a new opinion after the en banc decision, the original panel decision should still be coded as "en banc."
[blank]	Leave the Replaced field blank if, at the present time, none of the above events have occurred.

Replaced_Notes	
Description: This is a dropdown field to select the reason why the decision was replaced.	
Format: [category]	Example:
Notes: Reasons can be added if necessary, but coders should avoid adding new reasons unnecessarily.	

uniqueIDforrelateddecision	
This field is used to indicate the uniqueID for the other decision that is part of the replacement analysis. If there is more than one, use the one that directly replaces the document. The latest-in-time document should refer back to the first-in-time document.	
Format: [string]	Example:
Notes: this field uses a string format because some decisions relate to multiple other documents. Multiple uniqueIDs should be joined by a semicolon-space. [;]	