Patentability, Market, and Valuation Analysis of US-2025-0166007-A1

Holistic System Overview of the AI Marketing Platform

U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US-2025-0166007-A1, titled *"Personalized Artificial Intelligence Driven Marketing Platform,"* discloses an integrated system combining a **persistent AI companion**, a **closed-loop marketplace**, and an **autonomous shopping assistant**. The core concept is a digital **"companion" AI** (referred to as "Ted" in the disclosure) that engages with the user continuously in a human-like manner – essentially acting as a **24/7 personalized friend** who understands the user's needs and preferences [1] [2]. This AI companion uses advanced **intent modeling** and machine learning to **predict the user's requirements** in real-time and to **recommend products or services** as genuine, context-aware suggestions [3] [4]. Notably, the companion isn't limited to providing advice; it is designed to **autonomously carry out transactions** on the user's behalf when appropriate, executing purchases or payments seamlessly once a need is confirmed [5].

A distinguishing element is the creation of a **closed-end marketing ecosystem**. Businesses and service providers participate in a **curated marketplace** where the AI agents interface between consumers and vendors [6]. The system effectively *"implements a closed marketing loop"* enabling a **novel marketplace** in which AI companions connect **businesses and consumers** in personalized interactions [6]. Each business can subscribe or plug into the ecosystem, offering their products/services to be recommended by the AI **if** they match a user's identified needs. From the user's perspective, the AI companion handles discovery and even **execution of purchases**, while continually learning from those transactions to refine future recommendations [7] [5].

Another forward-looking concept associated with this platform is the idea of a **"TEDCard"** – envisioned as a universal, user-controlled digital identity anchored in the user's behavioral and transactional data (potentially backed by blockchain for security and ownership). *While the published application itself does not explicitly name a "TEDCard" or mention blockchain,* it describes the AI retrieving extensive data about the user (demographics, online activities, etc.) to build a rich **historical user profile** [8]. In essence, the system accumulates a comprehensive record of the user's preferences, habits, and context – which parallels the function of a unified digital identity or data wallet under user control. The inventor's broader vision (as gleaned from strategic context) is that this profile/identity would empower users within the ecosystem, letting them manage how their data-driven "digital self" (the AI companion plus its knowledge of the user) interacts with marketplaces. In theory, such an identity (the TEDCard) could be **portable and secure** (the mention of possible blockchain anchoring) and become a standard way people engage with AI-driven services in the future. This would elevate the platform from a single application to a **foundational architecture for human-AI interaction in commerce**.

In summary, the disclosed system uniquely fuses: **(1)** a deeply personalized, emotionally intelligent AI assistant that continuously engages the user in natural conversation [1] [9], **(2)** an integrated marketplace of businesses that the AI can sift through to find matching products/services [4] [6], and **(3)** the capability

for the AI to not only recommend but also **autonomously initiate and execute transactions** when authorized [5] . This holistic approach goes beyond conventional e-commerce or digital assistant models by treating the AI as both a **companion** and a **commerce agent**. The user benefits from a single trusted AI that can handle everything from emotional support and advice to shopping logistics, while businesses gain a highly targeted channel to consumers via the AI's recommendations. The integration of a potential **universal user identity (TEDCard)** further suggests a platform where user data and preferences are centrally but securely managed to personalize all interactions. These combined features form the basis for the analysis of patentability, challenges, and the market value of this invention.

Patentability and Claim Strategy Assessment

Novelty and Non-Obviousness of the Integrated System

At first glance, each individual component of the invention (AI digital assistants, recommendation engines, e-commerce transaction systems, user profiling, etc.) has existing art. However, the **novelty lies in the specific integration and depth of personalization** achieved by the described system. The patent's disclosure emphasizes that **traditional digital assistants** (like those in the prior art) make only basic product recommendations based on surface-level data, whereas this system uses a sophisticated **multi-factor "Intent Score" algorithm** and long-term learning to truly understand user needs [10] [11] . The AI "Ted" engages in human-like dialogue, offering **emotional support and companionship** in addition to shopping advice [12] [13] . This blend of emotional AI with transactional capability appears to be a unique aspect – for example, the application describes how *"besides the personalized recommendations, the disclosed system can offer communication and emotional support like a companion"* [12] . This dual role (therapeutic friend and buying assistant) is not found in standard e-commerce bots or voice assistants, which tends to support the argument for novelty.

Crucially, the system ties the AI's recommendation function to a **closed-loop marketplace** of participating vendors, creating a feedback cycle that isn't present in generic recommendation engines. The disclosure explicitly mentions *"implementing a closed marketing loop"* and enabling a *"novel marketplace"* where AI companions mediate between businesses and consumers [6] . This suggests a platform innovation: unlike open-ended systems (e.g., a voice assistant that can search the whole web), this invention contemplates a curated ecosystem wherein businesses **subscribe or integrate** into the platform so that their offerings can be recommended by the AI. This closed ecosystem approach, combined with a persistent AI agent representing the user's interests, provides a **two-sided network** (businesses on one side, users with AI agents on the other) that is likely novel. While **online marketplaces** and **AI recommendation systems** individually are well-known, the idea of an always-on **personal AI shopper** that automatically matches user needs with vendor offers in a controlled marketplace appears to be unprecedented or at least non-obvious when the application's priority date (Nov 16, 2023) is considered.

To assess non-obviousness, one must consider whether combining prior teachings would yield the claimed invention. Key prior art domains include: **personal digital assistants** (e.g., Apple's Siri or Google Assistant), **recommendation/prediction algorithms** (like those used by Amazon or Netflix to suggest products/content), and **e-commerce transaction automation**. Each of these existed before 2023, but largely in isolation. For instance, Apple's well-known *"Intelligent Automated Assistant"* (Siri) patent application describes a conversational assistant that can perform tasks in response to user requests [14] , and Amazon's Echo/Alexa system can handle voice shopping commands (e.g., reordering items). Additionally, recommendation engines leveraging user data have been patented and deployed widely (Amazon itself pioneered

personalized item recommendations based on browsing and purchase history decades ago). **However, none of the known references from major tech companies taught an AI that** *proactively* **forms a long-term emotional relationship with the user to anticipate needs, and then seamlessly triggers purchases via an integrated marketplace.** The disclosed *Intent Score algorithm* is particularly detailed, combining factors like personality archetypes, mood, context, and even "micro-trend spotting" in conversations [15] [16] to decide when and what to recommend. This level of psychological modeling for commerce goes beyond the scope of typical e-commerce personalization (which might use browsing history or basic demographics). It indicates a *novel synthesis of AI-driven emotional intelligence with transactional decision-making*.

Real-world developments around the priority date support the novelty of this holistic approach. A 2023 analysis by GlobalData noted that AI shopping assistants were an emerging innovation area and that *"some of these assistants can even place orders for consumers"* [17] . This confirms that **autonomous purchasing by AI** was a nascent concept, with early implementations just beginning to appear. Yet, those implementations (and the patents filed by others) tend to focus on narrow aspects – for example, **Walmart's** patents might cover automated reordering or in-store assistant bots, **SoftBank's** patents largely relate to robotic companions, and **Microsoft** recently patented an AI-based "emotional care" conversational agent without a commerce component [18] [19] . The invention in US-2025-0166007-A1 uniquely *combines all these aspects*: a human-like AI companion (akin to Microsoft's emotional agent) that remembers past interactions and provides support [20] [21] , *plus* a commerce engine that turns those intimate insights into actionable product/service recommendations and transactions. Given this combination, one can argue there is a **synergistic effect** that is non-obvious – the AI's emotional engagement drives higher-quality purchase predictions, and the closed marketplace feedback (purchase outcomes, user satisfaction) in turn refines the AI's personal model. This feedback loop (a true closed marketing loop [6]) is not taught or suggested by prior art in a single system.

That said, the **patent examiner will likely search for any prior art that comes close** to any portion of this system. We should be mindful that elements could be pieced together in an obviousness argument. For example, an examiner might cite one reference for an AI companion that learns user behavior (there are papers and patents on "personal companion" AI models), and another for an e-commerce recommendation platform that automatically triggers purchases. If such references exist, the inventor will need to distinguish the *specific integration* and perhaps highlight technical implementation details (e.g., the specific multi-layer intent scoring mechanism, or the secure user profile integration) to argue non-obviousness. On balance, the **holistic system as described appears to be novel** in concept. It pushes beyond straightforward **"targeted advertising"**, as noted in the application's background: conventional targeted ads and digital assistants rely on limited data and don't truly behave like understanding friends [10] [22] . By explicitly aiming to *"revolutionize the marketing sector by understanding users' preferences, dislikes, habits, and subtleties in communication"* [23] , the invention stakes out ground that prior art systems (which might be more transactional or one-size-fits-all) have not fully occupied. Thus, with careful claim drafting and argumentation, there is a reasonable basis to assert both **novelty and non-obviousness** for the integrated system.

Claim Amendments and Strategy for Patent Grant

The published application's **current claims** primarily focus on the method of generating personalized recommendations using the AI companion and intent scoring. For example, Claim 1 recites a method involving providing an interface for user interaction, retrieving user information from external databases to

build historical data, generating a digital assistant that learns user characteristics, predicting user requirements via an intent score algorithm, and suggesting recommendations for goods or services based on that intent. Dependent claims add features like presenting a **holographic avatar** of the companion (Claim 2), the companion introducing itself as a friend with an avatar resembling the user (Claim 3), integration with text messaging platforms (Claim 5), sentiment analysis to gauge the user's emotional state (Claim 6), details of the multi-factor intent scoring algorithm (Claims 7–12) [15] , and so on. These claims capture much of the AI's personalization and interaction aspects. **However, they do not yet explicitly claim some of the "holistic system" features** – notably, there is no express claim about the **marketplace or the AI executing purchases on the user's behalf**. Also, the "TEDCard" digital identity concept (if it was part of the provisional disclosure) is not present in the claims or specification explicitly by that name.

There is an opportunity (and likely a need) to amend or add claims to better cover the unique integration. Under U.S. patent rules, since this is a pending non-provisional application (filed Jan 9, 2024, claiming priority to a Nov 16, 2023 provisional [24] [25]), the applicant can amend the claims as long as they do not introduce new matter. If the provisional or original filing included support for the marketplace features and autonomous purchasing, the applicant could add claims that explicitly recite those elements. For example, a new independent claim could be formulated along the lines of: *"A personalized AI marketing system comprising an AI digital companion that learns a user's profile, and a closed marketplace platform of vendor offerings, wherein the AI companion autonomously selects and executes a purchase from the marketplace on the user's behalf when the user's intent score for a product exceeds a threshold."* Such a claim would directly capture the **end-to-end autonomy** (from sensing need to executing the transaction) that is implied in the description (e.g., the system executing real-time financial transactions like *"funds transfers, bill payments, and online purchases"* [5]). Similarly, claims could be added to protect the **marketplace ecosystem** aspect – e.g., *"wherein multiple businesses subscribe to the platform and provide product data to an engine that the AI queries for recommendations"*. The current disclosure notes that the system can *"refer to the database to find matching businesses/services to fulfill [a user's] need"* [26] , which suggests support for claiming a vendor database or network.

If any crucial piece was not explicitly in the original disclosure (for instance, if the **TEDCard identity on blockchain** is an idea developed after the provisional), the applicant may consider filing a **continuation-in-part (CIP)** to introduce that concept, or else emphasize the existing profile/security aspects already disclosed. The current spec does mention pulling user data from external sources and ensuring privacy (encryption, data protection) [27] , which could be a springboard for arguing a secure identity mechanism. While not blockchain per se, one could potentially claim *"a secure, user-authorized profile store (or token) that the AI uses to authenticate and retrieve user preferences"*, if supported.

In terms of **allowable claim scope**, it's important to anticipate patent office feedback. **Section 101 (abstract idea) concerns** are very likely in a case like this, since *"personalized recommendation based on user data"* can be seen as a business/algorithmic idea. The claims as written are method claims implemented on a processor, which an examiner might initially reject as an abstract idea of targeted marketing or personal coaching. To overcome this, the applicant may need to **amend the claims to include more concrete technical features** or highlight a specific improvement. For instance, incorporating the **holographic interface (Claim 2's concept) or the multi-channel messaging integration (Claim 5)** might help argue that the invention has a specific *technological* implementation (e.g., an AI avatar interacting via AR holography is not a generic business method, but a particular user interface innovation). The applicant should be prepared to argue that the invention improves computer technology – perhaps by **combining disparate systems (AI, databases, payment systems) in a novel way that solves the problem of**

fragmented user experiences in e-commerce. Emphasizing technical aspects like the system architecture (natural language engine + recommendation unit + messaging integration module + holographic module, all working in concert [28] [29]) can help steer the claims toward concrete territory.

From a procedural standpoint, the **probability of obtaining a granted patent** on the full holistic system will increase if the claims are **strategically consolidated and clarified**. The inventor might consider focusing one set of claims on the integrated method (as currently, plus additions) and perhaps introducing a complementary set of system claims. Indeed, Claim 14 in the publication is a system claim essentially mirroring Claim 1's method [30] [31] . To broaden protection, further independent claims could be added via a continuation application – for example, one claim focusing on *"a computer-readable medium"* implementing the AI (to cover software), and another focusing on *"the marketplace platform"* itself as an invention (covering the network system that interfaces with multiple AI companions). The inventor can also use the USPTO's **After Final Consideration Pilot** or file a **Request for Continued Examination (RCE)** if initial rejections are encountered, in order to iterate on claim language. Given the early stage of AI-in-commerce convergence, the USPTO might be receptive to well-defined claim sets that capture the invention's essence without covering mere abstract ideas.

In summary, to maximize the likelihood of **allowance** and robust protection, it is recommended to:

- **Tighten the claim language** around the unique combination (e.g., explicitly include the step of the AI automatically executing or facilitating a purchase transaction based on the recommendation, if supported). This draws a line between the invention and generic recommendation systems.
- **Emphasize technical integration** in the claims – for example, mention the specific modules (the patent names components like the Interaction Analytics and Recommendation Unit, NLPE, etc.) to show an inventive system architecture [28] . A revised claim might recite how the AI's modules interact with the marketplace's databases and with user devices (this interplay can be a point of novelty).
- **Use dependent claims or additional independents** to cover variations: one could claim the *emotional engagement* aspect (e.g., a method wherein the AI provides emotional support dialogues to build user trust, which then informs purchasing decisions), and separately claim the *marketplace transaction loop* aspect. This way, even if one aspect is found obvious, the other might be allowable.
- **Leverage the provisional's priority date** by ensuring all claim amendments are supported by the original disclosure (to avoid losing that Nov 2023 date). If some aspects (like a formal "digital identity card") were not explicitly described, consider carefully how to frame them in the current application's context (possibly as a secure profile or user account managed by the system, which is implicitly disclosed). If needed, file a **continuation with new matter** (CIP) to introduce and claim those aspects separately, without delaying the current application's prosecution.
- **Prepare to traverse 101 rejections** by highlighting how this invention is rooted in computer technology (AI algorithms, AR interfaces, real-time transaction processing, etc.) and is not simply a mental process or a method of organizing human activity. If necessary, amend a claim to include a particularly innovative technical step (for example, *"presenting the recommendation via a hyper-realistic holographic avatar interface"* or *"updating the user's profile in a blockchain ledger after each transaction"* if that were in scope).

By implementing these strategies, the **probability of obtaining a granted patent** covering the full envisioned system will be maximized. The current claims already capture the AI's personalized recommendation mechanism; with further tweaking to capture the **autonomous commerce execution and ecosystem integration**, the patent could issue with broad and durable claim coverage.

Prior Art and Competitive IP Challenges

In evaluating the patentability and future enforcement of this invention, it's critical to identify potential **prior art and existing patent holders** that cover similar subject matter. The holistic system spans multiple domains (AI companions, user modeling, recommendation systems, autonomous transactions, etc.), so we consider the closest prior art in each area and any **blocking patents** held by others.

1. AI Digital Assistants & Companions: There is a rich body of prior art on virtual assistants dating back at least a decade. For example, Apple's Siri (originally disclosed around 2011) and Google Now were early intelligent assistants. Patents such as US20120016678A1 (likely Apple's) describe an assistant that engages in conversational dialog to help users with tasks [14]. However, those systems were primarily reactive (responding to queries/commands) rather than forming a persistent persona that *proactively anticipates needs*. More recent art has trended toward more proactive and personalized agents. Notably, **Microsoft's patent on "providing emotional care in a session" (U.S. Patent No. 11,810,337 issued Nov. 7, 2023)** is highly relevant [32] [19]. It covers an AI conversational agent that essentially acts as a virtual counselor or companion, analyzing user inputs (even images) to gauge emotions and maintaining memory records of past sessions. This suggests that by late 2023, Microsoft was working on technology for AI that *remembers conversations and tailors responses to a user's emotional state*, much like the "Ted" companion in our case. The Microsoft patent, however, focuses on emotional well-being and doesn't mention making product recommendations or purchases. It could be seen as **partially overlapping prior art**: any claims about the AI providing emotional support and maintaining user profiles might face an obviousness challenge in light of Microsoft's work (and other similar research, possibly from therapeutic chatbot companies). That said, our invention's unique twist is tying that companion to a commerce engine – something Microsoft's patent does not contemplate.

Another potential prior art example is **SoftBank's "Pepper" robot companion** and related patents. SoftBank (and its subsidiary Aldebaran Robotics) developed Pepper as a social robot for homes and businesses. It's an AI companion that can converse, recognize emotions, etc. SoftBank's significant patent holdings (GlobalData reports SoftBank Group had *262 patents on AI shopping/assistant tech in 2021–2023* [33]) suggest they've protected various aspects of companion robots and perhaps their use in retail settings. If any of those patents describe Pepper or similar robots making shopping suggestions or transactions, they could be relevant prior art. However, Pepper was generally not an autonomous shopping agent; it was more of an in-store greeter or home companion that could, for example, answer questions or recommend items but not directly purchase them for you. We should still be cautious: with such a large portfolio, SoftBank may have patents on AI recommendation algorithms or multi-modal interaction that overlap conceptually.

2. Personalized Recommendation & User Modeling: Long before "AI companions," e-commerce platforms like Amazon and others patented various recommendation engines. These include collaborative filtering, personalized ranking of products, etc. A generic patent search might find references like Amazon's patent on item-to-item collaborative filtering (from early 2000s) or more recent machine-learning based recommenders. Additionally, academic literature on user modeling and intent inference could serve as non-patent prior art. The **intent scoring mechanism** in our invention – involving multi-level analysis of user inputs, context, personality, and so forth – might be challenged by prior work in user intent detection. However, the patent's detailed breakdown (with factors like semantic analysis, mood prediction, "micro-trend spotting," etc. in paragraphs [0119]–[0124] and [0141]–[0147]) [34] [35] is quite specific. Unless an identical approach was published, the combination of those specific techniques likely hasn't been seen in one system.

Nonetheless, an examiner might cite something like: an AI system that uses **psychological profiling** plus behavior logs for recommendations. It's worth noting companies like **Cambridge Analytica** (not in patents but in practice) used psychographic profiles for targeting content – illustrating that using personality archetypes for recommendations was known in concept. Any patent or publication on **"personalized digital marketing using user psychology"** could be considered. For example, IBM and others have patents on adaptive customer experiences; one could imagine IBM Watson-related patents that tailor responses based on user personality type. We should identify if any such patent exists pre-2024. No specific one comes to mind, but given the broad field, it's likely something tangentially relevant exists. The key will be that *no single prior art reference teaches the full multi-factor intent scoring combined with an AI companion interface* – meaning the inventor can argue the prior art teaches pieces, but not the *integrated approach with continuous learning and real-time use in a conversational agent*.

3. Marketplace Integration & Autonomous Purchasing: On the commerce side, there is prior art on systems that automate purchasing or at least the decision-making process. For instance, **Amazon has explored "anticipatory shipping"** (a system that ships products to depots near you before you buy them, based on prediction). While not an AI companion, it's an example of using data to pre-empt purchases. More directly, **Walmart** has shown interest in AI-driven retail; Walmart's patent filings (115 patents on AI shopping assistants in 2021–2023 [36]) might include a virtual shopping assistant that helps customers find and buy products. If Walmart or another retailer patented an "AI personal shopper" app that chats with users to recommend items (perhaps through text or a chatbot on their website), that could be close prior art. One example: Walmart had conceptual demos of a text-based concierge service for ordering products, though whether they patented those concepts is unclear. **eBay** and **Alibaba** might also have relevant IP; Alibaba in particular has invested in AI for shopping (though not listed in the top patent count). The **GlobalData report** cited earlier clearly shows many companies are in this space – even Magic Leap (with 104 patents [36] , possibly on AR shopping experiences) and **Amazon (50 patents)** [37] specifically on AI shopping assistants. One or more of Amazon's patents likely cover Alexa's capability to recommend or even automatically reorder household items (e.g., Amazon's Dash Replenishment service automates ordering supplies when running low, triggered by IoT devices – a form of autonomous purchasing based on user needs, albeit not via a conversational companion).

A concrete prior art example might be Amazon's patent on a voice agent that suggests and purchases items. While we don't have the number here, Amazon did file patents for Alexa's commerce features. If an examiner finds something like "Alexa automatically suggesting a product and ordering it with one command," they might use it in a 103 rejection alongside another reference that adds the "emotional companion" aspect.

4. Blocking IP and Competitors: Given the competitive landscape, there are several **companies holding portfolios that could overlap** with this invention:

- **Amazon.com** – As noted, Amazon has numerous patents on personalized recommendations, user modeling (they famously patented user-specific content based on profiles), and voice assistant commerce. Amazon could potentially have blocking IP on aspects like the actual transaction execution or the integration with payment systems. If this patent were granted broadly, Amazon might worry about its Alexa platform infringing, since Alexa can interact conversationally and facilitate purchases (though Alexa is not as personalized or autonomous as Ted is envisioned to be). Strategically, Amazon might respond by examining their own earlier filings to invalidate new broad claims. With ~50 recent patents in AI shopping assistants [37] , Amazon likely has prior art to cite or at

least the resources to challenge through an **inter partes review (IPR)** if needed. However, Amazon's patents would also make them a *potential licensee or buyer* of this IP if it is granted, especially if the claims cover something they plan to implement (see the market impact section below for value to Amazon).

- **Microsoft** – Microsoft's interest in AI companions (the emotional care patent, and their overall push with OpenAI's tech into personal assistants) means they have some overlapping IP, mainly on the AI side (less on commerce). Microsoft could hold blocking patents on techniques like analyzing user sentiment or maintaining long-term conversational memory. If our inventor's claims cover those, Microsoft's patents (which predate by being issued in 2023, filed in 2020) could be a hurdle (a 35 U.S.C. §102/§103 reference). Conversely, Microsoft might view a granted patent here as a complementary piece – since Microsoft doesn't operate a consumer marketplace like Amazon, they might not have patents on the commerce integration, so this patent could fill a gap for them if they ever wanted to enable buying/selling through an AI in, say, Windows or Teams.

- **Walmart** – Walmart's patents could pose prior art in combining AI with retail transactions. They have been actively patenting in-store AI and online e-commerce personalization. For example, Walmart acquired a company several years ago called Jet.com which filed patents on personalized shopping. If Walmart holds a patent on a "personal shopping concierge that learns a customer's preferences" (hypothetically), it could overlap. They also might have patents on using conversational interfaces for ordering (Walmart has experimented with text-based ordering through platforms like Messenger). With 115 patents noted [36] , Walmart certainly has something in this arena. Walmart as a company might be inclined to enforce its patents or at least use them defensively if an outside patent threatens their AI shopping services.

- **SoftBank/Naver Line** – SoftBank's high patent count suggests they have an expansive strategy, possibly including fundamental AI companion concepts. One should investigate if SoftBank has any specific patent that mentions making purchase recommendations via a companion robot or avatar. Additionally, the mention of **Nant Holdings IP (137 patents)** [38] implies entities like Nant (Patrick Soon-Shiong's group) are in this space, possibly focusing on AI for retail or marketing. Smaller companies like **Magic Leap** (who might patent AR assistants that show you virtual products in your space) could hold niche but important patents.

- **Alphabet/Google** – Google (Alphabet) had ~80 patents in this area in 2021–2023 [39] . Google likely has IP on Google Assistant's personalization and maybe their **Recommendations AI** platform used by retailers. One notable area: Google's development of *predictive assistants* (Google Now, and subsequent features) which try to serve you information you need before you ask (e.g., "time to leave for your meeting, traffic is heavy"). If Google filed patents on automatically providing suggestions (like "proactive assistant suggests you might want to buy X since you're low on it"), that could be significant prior art. Google also has been working on **self-driving shopping carts and other retail innovations**, though those are more physical. While Google's approach hasn't emphasized emotional bonding with the user, any broad claim about "an AI that predicts user needs and initiates actions" could trigger Google prior art.

- **Apple** – Apple is quieter in patent counts here (they're not listed in the top group, possibly because their filings are older or fewer in this niche). However, Apple did integrate a more proactive Siri suggestions feature in iOS (like app suggestions, calendar prompts). They may have patents on an

assistant leveraging context (location, time, usage patterns) to suggest actions. If Apple has any such patent, it might cover aspects of anticipating user needs, albeit not specifically for commerce. Also, Apple's focus on privacy means if our patent claims broad "retrieving info from external databases" [8] , Apple might not have done that due to their on-device approach, so maybe less conflict there.

In terms of **blocking commercialization**, if the inventor or a licensee tried to build this platform, they would need to navigate these companies' IP as well. For example, **if an independent startup implemented Ted and a closed marketplace, they might risk infringing Amazon or Walmart patents on recommendation algorithms or transaction processing.** So the patent landscape is a double-edged sword: while our inventor seeks broad rights, the giants have overlapping patents that could potentially be used against him/her (either to invalidate the patent or to assert against a product). It's common in such complex tech domains that a **patent thicket** exists – multiple parties holding pieces of the puzzle.

However, from a patentability standpoint, the presence of many players also provides a lot of prior art that the USPTO examiner can use. We anticipate that during prosecution, the examiner might cite some of these big-company patents. For instance, an examiner might combine **Microsoft's emotional companion patent** [19] with an **Amazon patent on automated purchasing** to argue that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to add a commerce transaction feature to an AI that engages a user emotionally. To overcome such a challenge, the inventor's attorney will have to point out that none of the prior art references actually teach the *specific unified system* – perhaps Microsoft's patent doesn't teach any marketplace integration (it's healthcare/therapy oriented), and Amazon's patent doesn't teach an AI that maintains a persistent personal relationship with the user (it might just be a functional shopping bot). It's the *convergence* of the two realms that forms the inventive step.

Another challenge could be if any **academic publications or earlier startups** described something similar. It's worth noting concepts like *personal shopper AI* have been fodder for science fiction and tech speculation. If someone wrote an article or white paper proposing a similar idea (even if not implemented), it could be used as prior art (in the U.S., printed publications count under §102). The inventor should be prepared to address such references if they surface.

In conclusion, **while no single prior art reference likely discloses this entire system, there are many that cover individual pieces**. The closest prior art for the **"AI companion"** aspect includes Microsoft's recent patent and possibly various robotic or chatbot companions. For the **"marketplace with autonomous purchasing"** aspect, prior art from Amazon, Walmart, etc., is relevant. These companies (Amazon, Microsoft, Walmart, SoftBank, Google, Magic Leap, and others) collectively hold a formidable portfolio of patents in AI-driven marketing and shopping assistants [40] [37] . They are the **key competitors in both patent and product space**. Any attempt to patent such a holistic system must navigate claims around what these players have done. Likewise, any attempt to commercialize it must either design around those existing patents or potentially seek cross-licensing.

From a patentability perspective, we identify the **most likely 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103 challenges** to be combinations of the above: an examiner might say the invention is obvious in light of, say, *Smith et al. patent (AI chatbot that learns user behavior) in view of Jones et al. patent (automated online purchasing system)*. Overcoming those will require careful argument that *neither Smith nor Jones nor any combination teaches the specific integration of an ever-present emotionally intelligent AI agent integrated with a closed commercial ecosystem.* The inventor's best assets in that argument are the explicit unique teachings in the application –

e.g., the **closed marketing loop** concept [6] , the **hyper-personal intent scoring** that feels like genuine friendly advice [4] , and the notion of the AI essentially becoming an **autonomous economic actor for the user** (a leap beyond just giving the user a recommendation, it takes action).

Finally, one must consider these companies' likely reactions if the patent is granted. Given the potential breadth, **big players might file oppositions or IPRs** to invalidate the patent if they feel threatened. For example, if Amazon perceives the granted claims as broad enough to cover Alexa's future functionality, they could be motivated to knock it out (they have the prior art and funds to do so). On the other hand, if the patent is specific enough, these companies might instead choose to **license or acquire** the patent to bolster their own position (e.g., Microsoft might license it to cover a commerce aspect that their emotional AI patent lacks, or Amazon might buy it to prevent others from owning a key piece of AI-commerce IP). This segues into the market and valuation considerations.

Market-Based Valuation Analysis

The potential value of this patent (and the underlying technology) can be considered under several scenarios – ranging from a conservative outcome where it finds niche use, up to an aggressive scenario where it becomes foundational in the industry. We will analyze **conservative, moderate, aggressive,** and an aspirational **"lottery ticket"** scenario, and then discuss how major companies like Amazon and Microsoft factor into these valuations.

Conservative Scenario – Niche Adoption and Incremental Value

In a conservative scenario, the patent's **commercial applicability** might be limited to a niche market or a single implementation. For instance, suppose the patent is granted but with narrower claims (perhaps covering the intent-scoring recommendation method but not fully the autonomous purchasing loop). The inventor (or licensee) might implement the technology as an app or a plugin for a specific sector – say, an AI shopping companion for a particular e-commerce site or a specific category (like fashion, or electronics). The **market size** in this case would be relatively small, as it's one AI assistant among many, not yet a universal platform.

Valuation in this scenario would be modest. The patent could be licensed to a few companies or used defensively by a small startup. **Estimated value** might be on the order of **single-digit millions** of dollars. This estimation comes from typical tech patent licensing: a unique, but narrow patent might license for perhaps \$0.5M–\$2M per licensee in a small market, or if sold outright to a mid-size company, perhaps \$5–\$10 million. The reasoning is that if the adoption is limited (maybe a few hundred thousand users of a specific app), the revenue derived from the patented technology is not huge, so the royalty or sale price stays relatively low. The patent's **enforceability** in this scenario might not be heavily tested – large players might ignore it if it's confined to a niche. Thus, risk is lower but so is reward.

In the conservative outlook, the patent serves as a nice-to-have asset, possibly helping its owner attract some investment or partnership but not changing industry paradigms. Its **strategic fit** would likely be with smaller companies looking for a differentiator. For example, a mid-tier retail chain could license the tech to create their own AI shopping buddy exclusive to their customers – giving them a boost in customer engagement. The value here is incremental: it might improve sales conversion or customer retention modestly. We can analogize to existing AI chatbot solutions: many e-commerce sites have simple chatbots – adding a patented personalization engine could improve those by some percentage, which while valuable,

is not transformative industry-wide. Thus, conservatively, the patent is an asset in the **few-million-dollar range** with localized impact.

Moderate Scenario – Broad Licensing or Early Corporate Acquisition

In a moderate scenario, the invention proves to have wider **market appeal and licensing potential**, but still falls short of global ubiquity. Here, let's assume the patent is granted with claims that cover the integrated system sufficiently, and one or more major companies show interest in implementing this AI-driven marketplace concept. Perhaps the patent attracts attention as a key piece for next-generation e-commerce personalization.

One possible moderate outcome is a **licensing program** where multiple companies license the patent to use in their own AI assistant offerings. For example, several retail companies (or tech companies offering retail AI solutions) might pay royalties to use the patented method of generating personalized AI-driven purchase recommendations. If, say, 5–10 companies license it at a rate that reflects significant value-add (imagine a royalty based on sales uplift or a fixed annual fee), the cumulative value could grow. Many tech patents that are not quite standard-essential but cover hot features have seen licensing deals in the **tens of millions**. We might estimate a moderate scenario valuation in the **$50–$100 million** range. This could come from, as an illustration: two big licensees paying \$20M each (because they see implementing this will yield them hundreds of millions in new sales over years), plus a handful of smaller deals or regional deals making up the rest.

Another moderate scenario path is an **outright acquisition** of the patent (or the startup holding it) by a larger entity at an early stage. If a company like Amazon or Microsoft – or even a retail giant like Walmart – believes this patent gives them a strategic edge or protects them from competition, they might acquire it. Tech giants have paid mid-eight to nine-figure sums for patent portfolios or critical patents in the past when it aligns with their strategy. For instance, if Amazon wanted to preempt any litigation or ensure exclusive rights, they could pay, say, \$75 million for it (a number that, while high, is a tiny fraction of Amazon's budget if the tech potentially influences billions in future sales). Microsoft has also spent comparable amounts on AI-related companies and IP, especially if it complements their roadmap (e.g. Microsoft's investment in OpenAI is huge; comparatively a sub-$100M patent buy is not unreasonable if it fills a gap).

Under the moderate scenario, the **strategic fit** becomes clearer: major companies might integrate the technology into their platforms. For example, **Amazon** could integrate the AI companion concept into Alexa or the Amazon shopping app, providing a "virtual personal shopper" mode for Prime members. This could increase customer spend and loyalty (imagine Alexa proactively arranging your groceries or gift purchases after learning your needs – Amazon would love the increased frictionless sales). **Microsoft**, on the other hand, might integrate it into their enterprise or consumer offerings – perhaps as part of Microsoft Teams for customer service bots, or in Windows as a personal assistant that can handle shopping across different stores (with Microsoft taking a cut via affiliate programs). Microsoft's strategic fit might also be in providing this as a service on Azure for retailers (Azure could offer an AI personalized marketing platform to its retail clients, powered by this patent's tech). Thus, the patent could be a linchpin in deals or product strategies that are moderately big.

Financially, we'd see this scenario valuing the patent in the tens of millions of dollars. The exact number would depend on negotiations and how defensible the patent is (the more broad and bulletproof the

claims, the higher the price). A licensed implementation across multiple Fortune 500 companies could easily justify a valuation towards \$100M if it yields each of them tens of millions in new profit.

Aggressive Scenario – Industry-Wide Adoption and Significant Control

In an aggressive scenario, the patented system becomes a **must-have feature in the evolution of e-commerce and digital marketing**, leading to widespread adoption and correspondingly higher valuations. Here we envision that within a few years, **AI-driven personalized marketing companions become standard** for many large companies. Perhaps consumers begin to expect their own "AI shopper" provided by their favorite retail platforms or devices. If our inventor's patent is broad and enforceable, it could cover many of these implementations, forcing either licensing on a grand scale or giving its owner a dominant position (via injunction threats, etc.).

One measure of an aggressive outcome is if **multiple Big Tech companies and major retailers all implement similar AI companion systems**. For instance, Amazon, Walmart, Target, Alibaba, and others each roll out AI companion apps that do what this patent describes (learn the user deeply, make autonomous recommendations/purchases in a closed loop with their marketplace). If the patent reads on all these implementations, the potential licensing base is enormous – essentially the **whole retail sector plus big tech's platforms**. Even at a modest royalty per user or per transaction, the numbers scale very high given the size of retail markets (e-commerce sales are trillions of dollars globally per year). Capturing a tiny slice as a royalty could mean big money.

For a concrete aggressive valuation, consider if the patent holder were able to get, say, **$0.01 per transaction or per recommended purchase made by any AI companion** – across billions of transactions, that's tens of millions of dollars annually in royalties. Or if structured as platform licensing, each major platform could pay on the order of \$10–\$50 million annually for rights (which for companies like Amazon or Alibaba would still be a tiny fraction of their revenue). It adds up quickly when the technology is ubiquitous. It's not unrealistic in this scenario to value the patent in the **hundreds of millions of dollars**, possibly reaching **$200–$500 million** if it truly covers a fundamental aspect of next-gen shopping.

Another angle: an **aggressive scenario might involve litigation and settlements**. If one major player decided not to license and the patent owner sued (and assuming the patent is strong and survives challenges), the damages or settlement could be large. For example, if by 2030 Amazon's AI shopping features are found to infringe and they've made billions through them, the patent holder could claim a reasonable royalty on those billions. Even a 0.5% royalty on \$10 billion in sales would be \$50 million, potentially multiplied by willfulness or used to negotiate a lump sum settlement perhaps higher. We have seen patent cases in tech occasionally lead to hundred-million-dollar verdicts or settlements when core functionality is at stake.

In terms of **strategic fit** in this scenario, the patent likely becomes a bargaining chip among giants. It might be exclusively held by one company to **keep others in check**. For example, **if Amazon acquired it aggressively**, they might enforce it against other retailers to hinder their AI shopping initiatives – effectively using it to dominate the AI-commerce space. Or vice versa, a consortium of retailers might license it to ensure they all can use the tech without fear of lawsuits, collectively keeping up with Amazon. The patent could also be the cornerstone of a startup that becomes an acquisition target in the hundreds of millions (like if the startup built a platform around the patent and proved it with millions of users, a giant might pay a big sum to take it over and integrate that capability).

Overall, the aggressive scenario sees the patent as **highly valuable – possibly in the upper hundreds of millions** – because it would be controlling a piece of technology that every major player needs in order to stay competitive in personalized AI commerce.

"Lottery Ticket" Scenario – Foundational IP with Billion-Dollar Implications

The "lottery ticket" scenario envisions that this patent becomes a **foundational IP right for AI-to-commerce infrastructure**, analogous to owning a patent on, say, the basic concept of a smartphone or internet shopping cart in earlier tech eras. This would mean the world shifts toward the architecture described in the patent (persistent AI agents mediating all consumer commerce), and the patent's claims are broad enough to cover essentially any implementation of that paradigm. It is a low-probability scenario (hence "lottery ticket"), but if it occurs, the value could be **astronomical – potentially reaching into the billions or even more**.

In this scenario, imagine that five or ten years from now, **every consumer has an AI companion (perhaps built into their AR glasses or phone) that handles their day-to-day purchases and interactions**. Moreover, imagine that **TEDCard-like digital identity** becomes the standard way people manage their preferences and data across platforms – possibly every major service plugs into a user-controlled profile (maybe on a blockchain or federated system) which an AI uses to interface with various marketplaces. If the concepts in this patent underpin that reality, then virtually **every significant transaction or AI assistant interaction could be deemed to fall under the patent's claims**.

The economic implications would be enormous: global retail e-commerce is expected to be in the tens of trillions of dollars in the coming decade. The AI-driven portion of that (AI influencing or executing purchases) could be a sizable chunk. Having a **foundational patent** could mean the patent holder is entitled to license fees or royalties from an entire industry's worth of commerce. Even a minuscule royalty (say 0.1% of transactions mediated by AI globally) could equate to billions of dollars annually if AI mediation becomes ubiquitous.

While it's unlikely a single patent can secure that level of control (usually there are ways to design around or alternative methods), this scenario posits that the patent is extremely broad and survives all challenges. The valuation in that case could be not just monetary but strategic to the point of being "priceless" for whoever controls it. It could shape **billion-dollar acquisitions** (a company might rather buy the patent for $1B than pay ongoing royalties, if forced), or it could spawn a new industry giant if the inventor's company holds onto it and becomes the gatekeeper of AI-commerce tech.

For context, consider historical parallels: foundational patents in telephone technology over a century ago created some of the biggest corporations; more recently, core patents in 3G/4G wireless standards have generated royalties in the tens of billions for companies like Qualcomm. If this invention becomes the **de facto architecture for AI-commerce**, owning its IP could yield a similar control point. Another comparison: the patent for the original web browser technology (Eolas patent) at one point was awarded huge damages (later overturned) that could have been in the billions because it was argued to cover basic interactive web content. Our scenario is that this AI marketing platform patent achieves that level of breadth and importance.

In this lottery scenario, beyond just monetary value, the **societal impact** is immense. If the TEDCard concept (universal digital identity with user-controlled data) is implemented as default, it could empower

consumers worldwide. People could have AI agents that truly represent their interests, potentially shifting power away from invasive advertising toward a more consensual, personalized model (the AI only recommends what aligns with your needs, and perhaps negotiates best deals for you). The **societal value** could include improved efficiency (people save time, get better products), improved mental well-being (the AI companion aspect provides support and reduces decision fatigue), and even economic shifts (brands might compete to be favored by personal AIs rather than bombarding users with ads). The patent, in this scenario, would be recognized as a foundational invention that enabled this new paradigm – akin to how foundational internet or smartphone patents enabled entire ecosystems.

Financially, we could be talking about valuations in the **billions of dollars**. Perhaps the patent holder collects royalties that accumulate to a billion over several years, or sells the rights in a bidding war among tech giants for an exorbitant sum. If the patent became part of a **larger portfolio or standard**, sometimes mechanisms like patent pools or FRAND licensing come in – but since this isn't a standards-driven tech (more a market-driven adoption), an individual holding could reap outsized rewards.

It's worth noting that such a scenario might also invite regulatory or legal challenges (antitrust concerns if one company controls such a fundamental technology, or legislative changes if it's seen as too critical to be monopolized). But those are outside the scope – the bottom line is that the *lottery ticket* scenario sees this patent's concept becoming the backbone of future commerce and thus holding value proportional to a significant fraction of global commerce infrastructure.

Strategic Fit and Impact on Major Companies

Given the above valuations and scenarios, it's clear that **major technology and retail companies** would have a strong interest in this patent and the system it protects. Two companies in particular were highlighted: **Amazon** and **Microsoft**. We will analyze each in terms of strategic fit and the estimated value of this patent to them, and also briefly consider others where relevant.

Amazon's Perspective and Strategic Fit

For **Amazon**, a personalized AI marketing companion that can autonomously drive purchases is directly aligned with their core business. Amazon's mission is to make shopping as easy and ubiquitous as possible – their entire ecosystem (Prime, Alexa, Dash, etc.) is built around removing friction between desire and purchase. An AI that lives with the user and understands their needs could dramatically increase Amazon's sales by capturing latent demand and timing recommendations perfectly (for instance, Ted might notice you're out of coffee pods and order them for you via Amazon exactly when needed, without you even going to the website – this is the ultimate frictionless commerce).

Amazon has already dipped its toes into aspects of this vision: - **Alexa voice assistant**: It can reorder items, suggest deals, and with user permission, even act on routines (e.g., "Alexa, buy more paper towels"). Alexa, however, is still user-initiated for the most part. The patent's concept would take Alexa to the next level: truly proactive and personalized. Amazon would see value in an AI that users trust like a friend, since trust and engagement lead to more purchases. The patent's emphasis on *feeling like genuine advice from a friend* [41] is gold for Amazon – it tackles one of marketing's biggest challenges: consumer trust and attention. If Alexa (or a similar Amazon AI) could converse naturally and supportively, users might confide needs they wouldn't otherwise, leading to more purchasing opportunities. - **Amazon's marketplace**: Amazon already has the closed ecosystem (millions of third-party sellers on their platform). Integrating an AI companion into that

ecosystem would tighten the loop: users have a constant Amazon touchpoint through the AI, and Amazon's sellers get their products recommended at the perfect moment. It's essentially what the patent describes – a closed marketing loop – and Amazon is one of the few with the scale to implement it across many product categories overnight. - **User data and Prime**: Amazon has a wealth of user data (purchase history, browsing, even devices like Ring, etc.). The patent's approach to aggregate data from external sources [8] aligns with Amazon's usage of its data troves to personalize experiences. Amazon could plug all its data into such an AI model and likely see a jump in recommendation accuracy.

Value to Amazon: If Amazon were to implement this system exclusively, it could strengthen their dominance in retail. They would likely be willing to pay significantly either to license or to own the patent exclusively. In a **moderate scenario**, Amazon might pay tens of millions for a license. In an **aggressive scenario**, they might pay hundreds of millions or even consider buying the inventor's company (if one exists around the patent) for a larger sum if that ensured they have an edge and others don't. Remember, Amazon spends billions on R&D and acquisitions each year; paying even, say, \$100M for IP that could increase their annual revenue by a fraction of a percent is justifiable. If the AI companion boosts user spending or retention noticeably, that could translate to billions in revenue, so Amazon's ROI on acquiring this IP could be very high.

Another strategic aspect: **defensive value**. Amazon would want to avoid a scenario where a competitor (or a patent troll) holds this patent and comes after them. If Amazon plans similar features (which is likely – the industry is moving this way), a granted broad patent in another's hands is a risk. Therefore, Amazon might acquire or license it as a defensive move, ensuring they have freedom to operate. If licensing is available, they'd do that; if not, they might try to buy it or, if the patent is not available, even challenge it (via IPR) to avoid being blocked. In any case, **Amazon is a key player who will care about this patent**.

From Amazon's perspective, an exclusive license or ownership is most valuable, because it would keep this technology away from their retail rivals. If Amazon owned the patent, they could theoretically require that any other implementation (like Walmart's AI companion, or Alibaba's) pay Amazon or be shut down, thereby hampering competitors' ability to copy Amazon's moves. This is a classic reason tech giants acquire patents.

Given Amazon's worldwide reach, the **geographic value** matters too – they'd be interested in U.S. rights for sure (since US is a major market and where a lot of patent litigation occurs), but also likely in international filings (did the inventor file PCT or in Europe/Asia?). If not, Amazon might see the U.S. patent as somewhat limited (they could deploy tech elsewhere without infringing). However, the U.S. market alone is huge, so Amazon would still be very interested in the U.S. patent.

In sum, **Amazon's strategic fit** for this patent is excellent: it aligns with their AI and commerce goals, and owning it could secure a competitive advantage. Therefore, Amazon might value this patent on the higher end of the spectrum – likely in the moderate to aggressive scenario range (tens to hundreds of millions). In the lottery scenario where it's foundational, Amazon would either have to pay hefty royalties or fight it tooth and nail, possibly preferring to pay a large sum to eliminate that uncertainty.

Microsoft's Perspective and Strategic Fit

For **Microsoft**, the connection is a bit different but still significant. Microsoft does not run a large consumer marketplace like Amazon's (they have an online store but it's mostly for their own products or software). However, Microsoft has been heavily investing in **AI as a platform**, especially with their partnership with

OpenAI and the launch of various "Copilot" products. Microsoft's vision (as hinted by CEO Satya Nadella and others) is to incorporate AI companions or assistants across work and life – essentially, they see personal AI agents as a computing paradigm (like every person might have an AI that helps with both work tasks and personal tasks, running on Microsoft's cloud).

In that context, a **personal AI marketing companion** could be a feature or service Microsoft offers, either directly to consumers or via enterprise. Here are a few strategic angles for Microsoft:

- **Windows/Device Integration**: Microsoft could integrate a personal assistant at the OS level (they tried with Cortana earlier, but now with AI advances, a much more capable "Windows Copilot" is being rolled out). If that assistant could also help you manage personal life tasks like shopping, it would increase user engagement with Microsoft's ecosystem. Imagine Windows not just telling you your calendar, but also reminding you "you mentioned you're running low on printer ink during our last conversation, shall I order more from Office Depot?" – and doing so seamlessly. Microsoft might not fulfill the order themselves, but they could partner or redirect through affiliate links, earning a commission. A patent covering that kind of functionality would be useful to have (or to license) to avoid lawsuits and to own the tech.
- **Azure and Enterprise Services**: Microsoft could incorporate this patented technology into a service for retailers. For instance, Microsoft Azure could offer an AI platform that any retailer can use to deploy their own branded AI companion for customers. Microsoft already provides AI services to businesses; an AI marketing companion platform could be a differentiator to attract big retail clients to Azure instead of, say, AWS. If Microsoft had rights to this patent, they could safely develop such a platform and offer it, possibly even making it a standard solution. This fits Microsoft's enterprise-oriented model – they might not directly compete with Amazon's retail, but they can supply tools to Amazon's competitors (like Walmart, etc.). In fact, Microsoft and Walmart formed a partnership a few years ago to collaborate on cloud/AI to counter Amazon – a patent like this could be leveraged in such partnerships (e.g., give Walmart an edge by powering their AI shopping assistant without fear of Amazon suing, because Microsoft has the rights).
- **Bing and Advertising**: Microsoft's Bing search and advertising business also stands to gain. Bing could evolve from a search engine into more of a **"shopping assistant"** itself (with the integration of ChatGPT, Bing is already answering questions conversationally). The patent's concept could augment Bing Chat – if Bing knows your preferences (perhaps via a Microsoft account acting like a TEDCard storing your behavior with permission), it could proactively suggest products or handle orders across different merchants. Microsoft, which competes with Google in search ads, might see this as the next step in search: turning search into conversation and transaction via AI. Owning or licensing the patent would ensure they can do so freely and possibly give them leverage if others try similar approaches.
- **Existing Patents**: Microsoft's own patent on emotional AI [18] [19] shows they're investing in companion AI tech. Combining that with a commerce capability (like this invention) could create a powerful product. If Microsoft doesn't have the commerce piece in their IP portfolio, this patent could fill that gap. They might even combine them in practice: a future Microsoft AI (maybe an evolution of Cortana or a new product) that cares for your well-being and can also handle your shopping – a holistic personal digital life manager. If Microsoft sensed this is where things are going (to compete with Google's and Apple's ecosystems), they'd want to secure the rights now.

Value to Microsoft: Microsoft tends to value patents for either defensive reasons or for enabling new features in their platforms without legal entanglement. If this patent is broad, Microsoft would likely want a license to avoid any risk that their AI initiatives infringe (especially since Microsoft is deploying AI in many

domains quickly – the last thing they want is a patent lawsuit slowing Copilot deployment). They have paid significant sums in the past for patent licenses (for example, Microsoft used to pay Android patent licenses to other companies, and also has bought patents like the AOL patent portfolio for over a billion in 2012). For a single patent like this, the value might not reach those heights unless it's clearly foundational. But Microsoft could see a **strategic fit** in, say, bundling this technology into Azure offerings, which is a multi-billion-dollar business; thus, even a large license fee (say \$50M or more) could be justified if it helps Azure land big retail clients.

Furthermore, Microsoft might consider the **offensive value**: if they own this patent, they could potentially assert it against certain competitors in the cloud or AI space, like Google (imagine Google's Assistant or future AI doing similar things – Microsoft having the patent could give them a legal edge or a cross-licensing chip in negotiations). Microsoft and Google have engaged in patent spats before, so this could be part of that chess game.

In a moderate scenario, Microsoft might license it non-exclusively for a decent sum (maybe mid-eight figures) to incorporate into their ecosystem. In an aggressive scenario, if Microsoft believed this will be a linchpin of future consumer tech, they could even buy it outright to prevent Amazon or Google from having it – possibly bidding up into nine figures if necessary. Microsoft has shown willingness to spend big on AI (e.g., \$10B on OpenAI partnership); while a patent is different, if it's truly key, a few hundred million is not off the table in a strategic bidding war situation.

Microsoft's strategic approach might also be collaborative: they could use the patent to strengthen partnerships. For example, if they had rights, they might freely sublicense it to friendly partners (like Walmart) as part of an Azure deal, thereby collectively fortifying an alliance against Amazon. Microsoft often operates via enabling their clients with tech rather than direct consumer monetization, so owning the IP could allow them to be the "arms dealer" for AI companions to all Amazon's competitors.

In summary, **Microsoft stands to benefit by integrating the technology into their AI portfolio and by using it as leverage in the competitive landscape**. The patent's value to Microsoft would likely be realized in how it boosts their cloud/services revenue and protects their AI rollouts, rather than direct commerce revenue (unlike Amazon). But indirectly, that's just as important. Therefore, Microsoft would likely assign a significant strategic value to this patent as well – not necessarily as high as Amazon in raw dollars (since Amazon directly monetizes commerce), but certainly high in terms of ensuring they aren't left behind in the AI assistant race. A safe estimate is that Microsoft would value a license or ownership in the same ballpark as Amazon in a moderate scenario (tens of millions), and in an aggressive scenario, they'd join the fray to possibly pay much more if needed to secure their position.

Other Notable Companies

(While not explicitly asked, it's worth briefly noting others in context for completeness.)

- **Google**: Google would view this technology as a natural extension to Google Assistant and their e-commerce moves (Google Shopping, etc.). Google's ad-driven model means an AI that knows what you want could place ads or suggestions very effectively. Google might license or buy such a patent to integrate across Android phones (imagine every Android phone coming with an AI that shops for you – that's massive reach). Google has deep pockets too and would not want to be locked out by an

Amazon or Microsoft owning this patent. So Google could be a contender in any bidding or licensing scenario.

- **Apple**: Apple's focus is on user experience and ecosystem lock-in. An AI shopping companion could be part of Siri or a future Apple AR glasses persona. Apple doesn't prioritize advertising revenue, but they do care about services revenue (Apple Card, Apple Pay, etc.). An AI that helps you buy might route payments through Apple's systems, earning them a cut. Apple historically is cautious with outside IP (they prefer to develop in-house or buy companies). If this patent became core to user experience, Apple might quietly license it or design around it. Apple tends not to openly license many patents but they have made deals (e.g., with Nokia, Ericsson for communications patents). If this were foundational, Apple would ensure they have rights one way or another (via cross-license or paying a fee as part of a broad settlement among big players).

- **Retailers (Walmart, etc.)**: Walmart and others would value the patent as a way to compete with Amazon's tech. They might not spend as lavishly as tech companies on IP, but Walmart has shown it's willing to invest heavily in technology to keep up (acquisitions like Jet.com for \$3B, etc.). If Walmart thought owning or co-owning this patent would give them a strategic tool to counter Amazon's Alexa/Prime ecosystem, they could be involved. Perhaps Walmart would partner with Microsoft (as mentioned) so that Microsoft secures the IP and Walmart benefits through usage.

- **International players**: Alibaba and Tencent in China, for instance, are building their own AI shopping assistants. While a US patent doesn't cover China, a lot of these companies also operate or have interest in the US market (Alibaba has US investments, Tencent owns stakes in US companies, etc.). They might not directly engage in buying a US patent, but they'll watch the space. A PCT application, if filed, could extend protection to regions like Europe where, say, Alibaba expanding might run into it. European retail companies (like Zalando or others) might eventually license if it becomes standard.

In all cases, the **enforceability** of the patent – i.e., how broad and solid the claims are – will ultimately determine how much weight it carries in these companies' calculations. If the claims are narrow or easy to design around, companies will just implement their version differently. If the claims are broad and withstand validity challenges, then the patent holder wields considerable power. Thus, the value to each company correlates with how likely it is that using this kind of AI companion in their business would infringe. Given the disclosure covers a wide swath of functionality (from emotional AI to transactions), a well-crafted claim could indeed cover many variations, making it harder to design around without leaving performance or features on the table.

To summarize the company-specific impact: **Amazon** could use the patent to supercharge and protect its e-commerce empire (high direct monetary payoff, hence high willingness to pay). **Microsoft** could use it to enhance its AI/cloud offerings and defend its vision of personal AI across applications (high strategic payoff, perhaps more indirect monetization). Both would likely place a substantial value on the patent. Other major players like Google and Apple would also not want to be left out and could end up part of licensing deals or even bidding wars if the patent becomes obviously critical. This competitive dynamic itself can drive the patent's valuation upward – the more parties see it as strategically important, the higher the "market price" for its rights in an open (or closed) bidding situation.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Realistic Path to Allowance: The most probable path to getting the full system patented is through **strategic claim refinement and persistence in prosecution**. Initially, the USPTO may only allow a narrower version (for example, the core recommendation method with intent scoring) if some aspects are deemed too abstract or too close to prior art. The inventor should be prepared for a multi-step process: likely a first Office Action with rejections under §§ 101 and 103. A realistic approach is to **amend the claims to incorporate clear novel technical elements** (as discussed, e.g., including the closed-loop marketplace or specific interface features) and provide strong arguments distinguishing prior art. The provisional filing date of Nov 2023 is recent, so prior art in AI moves fast – but the examiner is constrained to prior art before that date, meaning very new developments won't count against patentability. This is advantageous because the explosion of interest in AI companions and autonomous shopping mostly took off in late 2023 and 2024; by claiming priority in late 2023, the inventor is just ahead of that wave.

After amendments, the inventor might secure an allowance on a subset of claims. For example, the USPTO might allow claims focusing on the multi-factor intent score algorithm combined with an AI interface – something that can be presented as a technical improvement. On the other hand, broader claims that read on general "recommending products based on user data" might be rejected as obvious or abstract. The inventor should then **pursue additional claims via one or more continuation applications**. This is key: to capture the entire vision (companion + marketplace + autonomous execution + digital identity), it may be necessary to split it into multiple patents. One patent could issue on the core AI recommendation engine; another could be sought on the marketplace integration (maybe with method steps for onboarding vendors and an AI selecting vendors – a more business-method flavor, but could be crafted in system terms to survive 101). Yet another continuation could try to claim the concept of a unified user profile (the TEDCard idea) that interfaces with multiple services through the AI – effectively patenting the *platform architecture*.

Necessary amendments will likely include making sure the claims explicitly tie the AI's novel features to concrete implementations. For instance, incorporating the idea that the AI uses specific data sources (external databases, IoT signals, etc.) and triggers specific actions (like executing a purchase transaction through a payment API) can differentiate from any prior simplistic recommendation systems. Also, clarifying language such as "digital companion with a user-specific avatar that engages in ongoing natural language dialogue and automatically completes transactions with user authorization" would highlight the unique holistic nature. The inventor might have to overcome a **restriction requirement** too – the USPTO could say there are multiple inventions (one in the AI's emotional aspects, one in the commerce aspects). If that happens, the inventor should pick the one that is both most novel and broad (likely the AI-driven recommendation/commerce method) for the first patent, while pursuing others via divisional applications.

Securing the Broadest Enforceable Rights: Strategically, to get the broadest enforceable rights, the inventor should: - **File Continuations:** Do not accept a single patent as the end. File continuations to try different claim scopes. For example, one continuation could have extremely broad independent claims to test the waters (maybe claiming simply "an AI agent that autonomously conducts transactions on behalf of a user based on learned user preferences" in varying wording). Even if rejected, it keeps the dialogue open and maybe something can be allowed after negotiation. Another continuation could focus on the user profile/identity angle, which might involve different classes of prior art and could slip through if the examiner doesn't find a direct precedent. - **Claim the Marketplace explicitly:** Perhaps in a separate claim set or patent, ensure there's protection on the idea of a **closed ecosystem where businesses bid or subscribe to be recommended by AI companions**. The current application hints at this (e.g., "unique

marketplaces for a variety of businesses" [42]), but a patent claim that covers *any system where an AI intermediary personalizes a marketing channel between users and multiple business participants* would be very powerful. This may need careful wording to avoid pure business-method territory, but could be phrased in terms of networked system components. - **Leverage dependent claims to cover variations:** Many of the nice touches in the disclosure (holographic projection, text messaging integration, multi-modal interactions, reinforcement learning feedback loops [7] [21]) could be turned into claims so that competitors can't easily design around by omitting one feature. For instance, if Amazon tried to argue their system doesn't infringe because they don't use a "holographic avatar", one could fall back on a claim that doesn't require that but covers text or voice. Hence, having a matrix of claims covering all disclosed embodiments gives more enforceability. The inventor might consider a claim set directed at the **emotional support process** itself (since that could catch, say, Microsoft's implementation, ensuring the patent isn't circumvented by just not doing commerce but doing everything else). - **Maintain the priority date** for all key features: If the TEDCard or blockchain idea was indeed in the provisional (even implicitly like mention of secure ID or ledger), ensure any claims around that stay supported. If not, consider writing a new provisional and then a CIP to include it, but note that would get a later priority for those new aspects.

One more recommendation: **monitor competitors' patent applications** that are being published now (2024–2025). It might be wise for the inventor's legal team to file **third-party submissions** of prior art in those cases if they threaten to get claims granted that overlap (the inverse scenario). Likewise, if any competitor patent gets very close, consider whether an **interference or derivation proceeding** is applicable (though those are rare under current law, since it's first-to-file, it would only apply if someone filed slightly earlier and perhaps with misappropriated ideas).

Given all the above, the expected likely outcome is that the inventor can secure a patent on the core AI-driven personalization method. The **full system claims** might require some narrowing or splitting, but with perseverance, it's plausible to get a set of patents that collectively cover the envisioned platform. The inventor should be prepared for a timeline of a few years and possibly appeals to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board if the examiner is unconvinced. The investment could be well worth it, considering the market trends.

Forecast of Economic and Societal Value: If the vision behind the *Personalized AI Driven Marketing Platform* comes to fruition (especially the TEDCard-like identity and ubiquitous AI companion usage), the patent could have tremendous economic and societal impact. Economically, as discussed in the "lottery" scenario, it could be a cornerstone of trillions of dollars in commerce. The patent owner, in that future, would either be reaping royalties from many implementations or have been bought out for a fortune, or might have built their own dominant platform. We can foresee a scenario where, for example, **this patent forms the basis of a key licensing program that every device manufacturer and retailer signs onto**, akin to how certain audio or video codec patents became standard in every device (with each manufacturer paying a fee). That would generate steady, significant income and could even influence industry standards – e.g., if the TEDCard concept involves blockchain, maybe an industry consortium adopts a standardized "Consumer AI Profile Token" and the patent is licensed as part of that standard for all to use (with the inventor compensated accordingly).

Societally, should the TEDCard universal identity take hold, individuals could gain **greater control over their data and how AI uses it**. The patent's underlying philosophy is very user-centric: the AI serves the user's needs first (even ethically, it mentions not replacing human relationships but complementing them [21] [43]). If implemented widely, this could shift the balance from intrusive advertising (where companies

target users externally) to a model where each user's own AI filters and chooses what offers to accept based on genuine benefit to the user. That is a profound change – it could improve consumer welfare by reducing spam and irrelevant marketing, and improving satisfaction (since recommendations align with actual needs and even emotional readiness). Additionally, the companion aspect could have mental health benefits: people might feel less lonely or stressed when mundane tasks are handled and when they have an ever-available listener. The societal value is of course double-edged (concerns about people becoming too reliant on AI, privacy issues if not properly handled, etc., would arise), but if the inventor's vision of a *user-controlled, ethical AI companion* is realized, it sets a positive template for human-AI interaction.

Strategic Recommendations: To maximize the chances of this positive outcome, the inventor should: - **Secure broad rights now** through the strategies above, to ensure that as the industry grows, this IP remains relevant and enforceable. - **Engage with industry** to possibly steer adoption. Sometimes being part of setting standards or protocols (for instance, a standard for personal AI profiles) can both advance the vision and ensure the patent is acknowledged (possibly leading to essential patent status in a standard, which guarantees licensing revenue, albeit often at regulated rates). If the inventor's aim is not just financial but also to see a TEDCard architecture become reality, working with consortia or tech alliances might be prudent. They could contribute ideas (while protected by their patents) and gain influence. - **Consider partnerships or early licensing with key players** like Amazon or Microsoft rather than adversarial enforcement, if the goal is to get the technology widely used. A cooperative approach (like Microsoft licensing it to empower many clients) could proliferate the system faster, which in turn could make the patent more valuable (network effects). - **Keep innovating and patenting** around the core idea – the field will evolve, and complementary patents (improvements, specific applications) can strengthen the overall position. For example, if tomorrow new AI techniques (like advanced federated learning on user data for privacy) become relevant to this concept, patent those as continuations. The broader and more up-to-date the portfolio, the harder it is for others to invent around it.

In conclusion, **US-2025-0166007-A1 stands at the intersection of AI companionship and autonomous commerce**, a space poised for explosive growth. The published patent provides a strong foundation, describing an AI that is simultaneously a friend, a personal shopper, and a gateway to a marketplace [12] [6] . By navigating the patenting process wisely – carving out the unique aspects and securing them – the inventor can obtain enforceable rights that cover this integrated system. If successful, these rights could be extremely influential: in the moderate view, they could yield substantial licensing deals or an acquisition in the tens of millions; in the optimistic view, they could shape how major companies implement AI commerce and potentially position the inventor (or the patent's owner) to reap a portion of the value created by future AI-driven marketplaces. And in the most ambitious vision, where the **TEDCard concept becomes the default architecture for human-AI interaction**, this invention could indeed be seen as a **foundational innovation** of the AI age – with commensurate economic value (potentially in the billions) and societal impact, changing the way we interact with technology and commerce on a daily basis. All these outcomes hinge on anchoring the patent's claims to the innovative integration described in the application, and on the inventor's ability to align legal strategy with the fast-moving trajectory of AI in commerce. The opportunity is vast, and with the right steps, this patent (and its progeny) could secure a **cornerstone intellectual property position** in the emerging era of AI-driven marketing platforms.

Sources:

- U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US-2025-0166007-A1 (Calascione), *"Personalized Artificial Intelligence Driven Marketing Platform,"* published May 22, 2025 [44] [6] [4] .

- Microsoft Patent No. 11,810,337 (issued 2023), *"Providing emotional care in a session between a user and a conversational agent,"* indicating AI companion for emotional support [18] [19] .
- GlobalData analysis of AI shopping assistant innovation, highlighting key patent holders 2021–2023 (SoftBank 262, Walmart 115, Amazon 50, etc.) and noting some assistants can autonomously place orders [40] [17] .
- Excerpts from US-2025-0166007-A1 specification illustrating key features: *digital companion acting like a human friend* [1] , *closed marketing loop enabling a novel marketplace* [6] , *AI executing real-time transactions like online purchases* [5] , and *multi-factor intent scoring for personalized recommendations* [4] .

---

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [15] [16] [21] [22] [23] [24] [25] [26] [27] [28] [29] [30] [31] [34] [35] [41] [42] [43] [44] 70307_18408392_05-22-2025_NTC.PUB copy 2.pdf

file://file-Tb3AkTjJLiGvTK3Xpad3jZ

[14] US20120016678A1 - Intelligent Automated Assistant - Google Patents

https://patents.google.com/patent/US20120016678A1/en

[17] [33] [36] [37] [38] [39] [40] Who are the leading innovators in AI shopping assistants for the retail industry?

https://www.retail-insight-network.com/data-insights/innovators-ai-shopping-assistants-retail/

[18] [20] Microsoft patented an AI app that acts as your companion and provides… | Matteo Castiello | 34 comments

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/matteocastiello_microsoft-patented-an-ai-app-that-acts-as-activity-7213473964751265792-dXiy

[19] [32] U.S. Patent for Providing emotional care in a session Patent (Patent # 11,810,337 issued November 7, 2023) - Justia Patents Search

https://patents.justia.com/patent/11810337