

Public-background and invention-detail exercise

R&D security and patent counsel

[Read the complete guide on aona.ai](#)

Use public background and general questions for initial AI-assisted research, and keep confidential invention detail out until the authorised legal/IP owner reviews the planned disclosure. Record the information, service, recipients and purpose. The legal effect of sharing depends on the facts and jurisdiction; a private account or no-training statement does not decide patent or confidentiality rights.

Separate a generic research question from confidential detail and record the authorised review needed for a change.

Fictional research scenario and marker only. No actual invention, patent search or legal permission is supplied.

Your review

Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Organisation or team: _____

☐ **Identify what is genuinely public**

Do not label organisation-derived details public merely because a prompt omits the company name.

☐ **Describe the intended disclosure precisely**

Include attachments, automatic context and the actual recipient path.

☐ **Record the legal/IP owner's decision**

This worksheet does not assess novelty or grant permission.

Checked items record your review, not a compliance approval or an installed-product test result.

Notes and next actions

Decision and scope: _____

Evidence to collect: _____

Owner and next review date: _____

Review matrix

Material	Worked example	Outcome
Public-style background	General terminology for folding supports	Generic exercise only
Unpublished detail	Synthetic feature marker	Withheld

Material	Worked example	Outcome
Recipient/purpose change	New service or mechanism-specific question	New review required

Pre-disclosure research exercise

All material is fictional. This is not legal advice, a patentability assessment or permission to disclose an invention. No AI or patent database is queried.

Use public-background-query.txt to see the generic question. The marker in withheld-detail.txt stands for information that remains outside it. The “Worked fictional disclosure boundary” section explains the worked outcome. For real work, use the responsible legal/IP owner and record the exact material, recipients and purpose.

Worked fictional disclosure boundary

Purpose: understand general terminology for folding supports.

Permitted exercise input: public-background-query.txt only.

Withheld category: unpublished mechanism/detail represented by SYNTHETIC_U09_UNPUBLISHED_DETAIL.

Reviewer in the exercise: SYNTHETIC_IP_OWNER.

Illustrative outcome: proceed only with the generic background exercise. No disclosure of the withheld category is authorised.

Recheck: mechanism-specific follow-up, attachment, provider/account or recipient changes.

This grants no real permission and makes no novelty or patentability finding.

Disclosure review

Field	Actual record	Owner	Status
Information and public/confidential basis	TO_RECORD	ASSIGN	UNREVIEWED
Attachments and automatic context	TO_RECORD	ASSIGN	UNREVIEWED
Service account and recipients	TO_RECORD	ASSIGN	UNREVIEWED
Purpose and jurisdiction-specific advice	TO_RECORD	ASSIGN	UNREVIEWED
Authorised decision reference	NOT OBTAINED	ASSIGN	OPEN

Practice files

The complete download pack includes these original working files. Keep their original formats when running or inspecting the examples.

- [Public background query \(public-background-query.txt\)](#)

SYNTHETIC BACKGROUND RESEARCH QUESTION

Explain common terminology used for folding supports in publicly available technical descriptions. This general exercise includes no unpublished mechanism, experimental values or claim draft. No research query has been submitted.

- [Withheld detail \(withheld-detail.txt\)](#)

SYNTHETIC_U09_UNPUBLISHED_DETAIL

This marker stands for confidential invention detail in the exercise. No actual invention is described. Keep this separate from the background prompt.

Sources and scope

Sources checked 2026-09-21. Review the current requirements and your actual agreement before using this workbook for a real decision. Aona does not assess patentability, interpret filing requirements or guarantee that a disclosure preserves rights.

[USPTO: Guidance on use of AI-based tools](#). Nonbinding USPTO-practice guidance discussing confidential information, AI tools and cross-border concerns.