

Comparison Between Prosecution History and ProGuide Results on Titles
February 10, 2026

Below is a comparison between (1) what the prosecution histories show the Examiner objected to and required regarding titles as reflected in What's New 2.10.26, and (2) what the ProGuide-based analysis objected to and recommended.

1. Detachable Carrier for Beach Badges/Pool Tags - Application 29/814,518

The Examiner objected because the forward slash "/" was considered unconventional punctuation and because the title ended in a period. The Examiner recommended the title "Detachable Carrier for Beach Badges and Pool Tags".

The ProGuide analysis objected to the slash as improper and ambiguous because it suggests alternative articles rather than one definite article. The ProGuide analysis recommended title "Detachable Carrier for Beach Badges and Pool Tags" (as a correction for the slash), but also recommended considering a more neutral article name such as Badge Carrier or Badge Holder to avoid use-based wording.

2. Wall Materials For Buildings - Application 29/942,828

The Examiner rejected the claim because "materials" does not constitute a statutory article of manufacture and is not a specific article under 35 U.S.C. § 171. The Examiner recommended the title "Wall Panel for Buildings".

The ProGuide analysis objected because "materials" is a broad category rather than a definite article of manufacture, and the title fails to properly identify a particular article. The ProGuide analysis recommended the title "Wall Panel" (or "Wall Covering" / "Wall Tile" depending on drawings). It specifically recommended "Wall Panel" as the safest correction.

3. Ornamental Wheel Design - Application 29/910,412

The Examiner required amendment because the title improperly included "Design" and redundant descriptive wording ("Ornamental"). The Examiner recommended the title "Vehicle Wheel".

The ProGuide analysis objected because "Design" is prohibited and "Ornamental" is redundant since the claim already specifies ornamental design. The ProGuide analysis recommended the title "Wheel" or "Vehicle Wheel," with "Wheel" being the cleanest and safest title.

4. Aircraft or Space Vehicle - Application 29/839,964

The Examiner objected because the specification and figure descriptions used "aircraft or space vehicle," which does not designate a single article and was inconsistent with the claim and preamble. The Examiner recommended the title "Aircraft".

The ProGuide analysis objected because “or” creates an alternative article designation and fails to identify a single particular article of manufacture. The ProGuide analysis recommended selecting one article designation, such as “Aircraft” or “Space Vehicle,” and using it consistently throughout the application.

5. Adjustable Wire/Light Stub-Out Support - Application 29/937,464

The Examiner objected because the title included functional wording (“adjustable”) and included the slash construction (“wire/light”). The Examiner recommended the title “Stub Out Support”.

The ProGuide analysis objected for the same reasons, specifically that the slash created ambiguity and that “adjustable” is functional language. The ProGuide analysis recommended the safer neutral article titles “Support Bracket” or “Mounting Bracket,” but noted that “Stub-Out Support” may be acceptable depending on examiner tolerance.

6. Single Motor Square Tube Lifting Table - Application 29/915,462

The Examiner objected because “single motor square tube” described function and structure, which are utility-type characteristics. The Examiner recommended the title “Lifting Table”.

The ProGuide analysis objected because “single motor” and “square tube” describe internal construction and structural engineering features rather than identifying the article. The ProGuide analysis recommended the title “Lift Table” or “Table,” with “Lift Table” being preferred as a recognized neutral subspecies.

7. Foot Pedal for Floor Car Jack Which is Detachable and with Upper Foot Cover - Application 29/917,703

The Examiner objected because the title included excessive descriptive and functional language, including “detachable” and “upper foot cover.” The Examiner recommended the title “Floor Car Jack Foot Pedal”.

The ProGuide analysis objected because the title reads like a utility-style sentence and includes functional and structural descriptors rather than a neutral article name. The ProGuide analysis recommended the title “Foot Pedal” as the safest correction, or alternatively “Foot Pedal for Jack.”

8. Vehicular Pillar Trim and Front Panel with Gravity Text - Application 29/892,002

The Examiner required simplification because the title was overly specific, included positional descriptors, and referenced surface ornamentation (“gravity text”). The Examiner recommended the title “Trim for Vehicle”.

The ProGuide analysis objected because the title appeared to identify multiple articles (“pillar trim” and “front panel”) and improperly referenced surface content (“with Gravity Text”). The ProGuide analysis recommended “Combination Pillar Trim and Front Panel” if both components were claimed, or otherwise “Pillar Trim” or “Front Panel” depending on the drawings, while noting that “Trim for Vehicle” is a safe examiner-friendly correction.

9. Car Magnetic Magsafe Car Mount - Application 29/906,660

The Examiner required removal of “MAGSAFE” because it is a trademark/brand identifier. The Examiner recommended the title “Car Magnetic Car Mount”.

The ProGuide analysis objected because “MAGSAFE” is improper branding and because “magnetic” is a functional descriptor that describes how the mount works rather than what it is. The ProGuide analysis recommended the title “Vehicle Phone Mount” or “Vehicle Mount,” and noted that the Examiner’s final title still retained a functional descriptor.

10. Anxiety Relief Toy - Application 29/934,280

The Examiner required removal of “anxiety relief” because it describes a functional result rather than identifying the article. The Examiner recommended the title “Toy”.

The ProGuide analysis objected because “anxiety relief” is result-oriented functional language and is improper in a design title. The ProGuide analysis recommended “Toy” or “Fidget Toy,” with “Toy” being the safest neutral correction.

11. Compostable Oval Bowl And Lid - Application 29/941,259

The Examiner required removal of “compostable” because it is a material/environmental characteristic descriptor. The Examiner recommended the title “Oval Bowl with Lid”.

The ProGuide analysis objected because “compostable” is a characteristic descriptor, “oval” is an ornamental shape descriptor, and “bowl and lid” suggests multiple articles that should be expressed as a combination. The ProGuide analysis recommended “Combination Bowl and Lid” or “Bowl with Lid,” and noted that the Examiner retained “oval” even though best practice would normally remove it.

12. Vehicle Exterior Headlight - Application 29/889,091

The Examiner required removal of “exterior” because it is an unnecessary positional/location descriptor. The Examiner recommended the title “Vehicle Headlight”.

The ProGuide analysis objected for the same reason, that “exterior” is surplus descriptive wording and not part of the generally recognized article name. The ProGuide analysis recommended “Headlight” as the cleanest correction, or alternatively “Vehicle Headlight.”

13. Jewelry (Earring) – Application 29/818,136

The Examiner objected because the parenthetical designation “(Earring)” was treated as an improper subspecies identifier and not a standardized article designation. The Examiner required the title to be amended to a broader recognized article class. The Examiner recommended the title “Article of Jewelry.”

The ProGuide analysis objected because parenthetical subspecies wording may be treated as unnecessary, non-standard, or overly narrow, and because examiners often require the article to be identified by a recognized article name generally used by the public and consistent with USPTO classification practice. The ProGuide analysis recommended the title “Article of Jewelry,” while noting that “Earring” may be acceptable in some cases if the Examiner does not insist on the broader standardized class designation.

14. Network Storage - Application 29/878,952

The Examiner objected because “Network Storage” did not clearly identify a definite article of manufacture and did not match the standardized terminology required for consistent claim/title correspondence. The Examiner required amendment so that the title precisely matched the claim terminology and identified a recognized article name. The Examiner recommended the title “Network Storage Device.”

The ProGuide analysis objected because “Network Storage” is incomplete and ambiguous and may be treated as a general function or concept rather than a specific article of manufacture. The ProGuide analysis further objected because the title must correspond exactly to the claim language and should be stated in a clear noun form suitable for classification and searching. The ProGuide analysis recommended the corrected title “Network Storage Device.”

Overall Comparison Summary

The Examiner objections and the ProGuide analysis aligned strongly in nearly every case. Both consistently flagged slashes, alternative-article phrasing (“or”), branding, and functional/structural descriptors. The main differences were in how aggressive the recommended correction was. In several examples, the Examiner permitted a more descriptive corrected title than the ProGuide analysis would recommend as “best practice,” such as Car Magnetic Car Mount and Oval Bowl with Lid. The ProGuide analysis generally recommended stripping titles down further to the most neutral article name in order to reduce objection risk and reduce future narrowing risk.