

Provisional Patent Application of
DOUG SEMONCHE & EUGEN TARNOW

for

TITLE: COMMENT SYSTEM STORED AND ADMINISTERED SEPARATELY FROM
THE REVIEWED CONTENT ALLOWING CONTENT FOLLOWING, AUTHOR
COPYRIGHT, AUTHOR REPUTATION, COMMENT FILTERING

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

A portion of the disclosure of this patent document contains material that is subject to copyright protection. The copyright owner has no objection to the facsimile reproduction by anyone of the patent document or the patent disclosure, as it appears in the Patent and Trademark Office patent file or records, but otherwise reserves all copyright rights whatsoever.

PRIOR ART

The following lists some prior art that presently appears relevant.

U. S. Patents

Patent or Pub. Nr.	Kind Code	Issue or Pub. Date	Patentee or Applicant
9311678	B2	2016, Apr. 12	Ray C. He, Fasciano Austin Haugen, Catherine Cissy Lee, Evan Sharp
7409362	B2	2008, Aug. 5	Hermann Calabria

U. S. Published Patent Applications

Patent or Pub. Nr.	Kind Code	Publication Date	Patentee or Applicant
2012/0158753	A1	2012-06-21	Ray C. He, Austin Haugen, Catherine Cissy Lee, Evan Sharp

Non-Patent Literature Documents in Alphabetical Order by Author

JOSEPH LICHTERMAN (2017). This site is “taking the edge off rant mode” by making readers pass a quiz before commenting. Niemanlab.org.
<http://www.niemanlab.org/2017/03/this-site-is-taking-the-edge-off-rant-mode-by-making-readers-pass-a-quiz-before-commenting/>

BACKGROUND—IMPORTANCE OF COMMENTS

An important aspect of publishing online content is the ability to have conversations between the creators and the consumers, as well as among the consumers, about the online content. Commenting is so popular among consumers of content that almost all publishers presently allow some form of reader commenting. Commenting provides reader engagement and feedback to the content publisher.

Before the internet, commenting on content was typically restricted to professional reviewers. Since the appearance of the internet commenting is fundamental. Indeed, the very beginning of the internet cemented this: the development of the original Internet communication protocol as well as major parts of the infrastructure of the Internet were done by published documents called a “Request for Comments” or “RFC.” Anyone with an interest in the subject could submit a comment to the RFC author for consideration. In the crucible of criticism and suggestions a consensus would emerge.

The conversation about online content (be it an article, a blog post, a podcast, a picture, a video clip, etc.) typically proceeds via a reader comment and/or rating system.

A page of online content displays comments in the way the content publisher desires or the publishing software determines. For example, the display is often physically next to

the original content and displayed in reverse chronological order. Sometimes readers can indicate a favorable reaction to particular comments and the sum of the voting is displayed as a rank given to the comment so other readers can see the user consensus on particular comments. Comments may refer to the original content or be made in response to other comments. Note that while the comments are often rated, rating of the content itself is more rare and displaying that rating prominently is extremely rare (nytimes.com does not do it, foxnews.com does not do it, YouTube is an exception presumably because most of the content is not generated by YouTube), even more rare is to have that rating appear next to a clickable link (not even YouTube does that)..

Limitations of the Current Art

Publisher-CommentAuthor Tensions

In existing comment systems, the publisher selects and administers the software and hardware used to publish her underlying content. Because the interests of the publisher and the CommentAuthors are not aligned, this can negatively impact reader comments. For example, the control panel of the popular Wordpress publishing software include the option to not allow reader comments at all and the same is true for blogging software such as Lotus Notes blogs. While a CommentAuthor could self-publish a comment referring to particular content completely independently of the published Content, the chance that the comment would become known to even a small fraction of the viewers of the content is small.

If comments are allowed, they need not be permanent. The publisher can decide to remove comments. There is a natural temptation for the publisher to limit critical comments. The public's view could be misrepresented by selective rejection of comments, delaying publishing certain comments (early comments have a much higher probability of being read than later comments), or even allowing advertisers to have a veto over individual comments. Some publishers allow authors to reject comments that the authors feel are too negative or personal. In addition, the publisher might have a

personal preference on the issues discussed and could suppress comments that undermine the publisher's view while promoting comments that support it.

Publishers also curate Comments which contain overt or subtle advertisements, illegal or offensive content, defamatory statements, threats, and unauthorized disclosures. The publisher may be responsible for complying with the regulations of many jurisdictions regarding privacy, prohibited content, etc.

The CommentAuthor's commenting is in many ways futile. He or she does not own the copyright to the comments, does not have a right to edit or even delete the comments and does not have a way to be identified across different websites. Beyond "thumbs up" and sometimes positive replies, there is no reward to commenting other than venting.

Comment platforms are not standardized so CommentAuthors are faced with a bewildering number of commenting systems. The interface for reading and submitting comments is different at each site, requiring the mastering of new knowledge and skills. The publisher can make countless selections of different presentations, control systems, and display options.

Publisher-Reader Tensions

Comments are usually presented below the publisher content. This prevents them from functioning as a filter for an initial decision whether to read or reject the content, potentially wasting the time of the reader.

Individual readers may different want to organize comments differently, and in the same individual way across publishers. The reader may want to focus on comments with a high or low degree of intellectual content, or on comments from authors they like.

Reader-CommentAuthor Tensions

Comments can distract from the publisher content by drawing attention to other content rather than focusing the comment on the present content. Comments may also be not to the liking of the reader who would like to filter out comments or particular types.

BACKGROUND--ADVANTAGES

According to one or more aspects, our system has one or more of the following advantages:

1. CommentReaders who enjoy online Comments will be able to trust that all Comments are included without edits other than by the CommentAuthor.
2. ContentReaders who would like to see Comments associated with Content will be able to see them in a unified format no matter the source of the Content.
3. CommentAuthor identities will be preserved across different Content allowing for CommentAuthors to gain fame or notoriety for their commenting.
4. CommentReaders will be able to see Comments categorized by the type of CommentAuthor, the type of Comment, and ranked by themselves or by others.
5. The Comments will function as a ranking system of Content functioning as a filter allowing CommentReaders to make a decision to read or not read the Content
6. These Comments will allow search engines to customize the results accordingly.
7. The Content generated will be a "Google/Facebook" of Comments and a Wikipedia of CommentAuthorProfiles which can be used to enhance CommentAuthor reputation, to allow for location of expertise and friends and dates, and for commercial and political advertisement.
8. Allows Content providers to outsource the Comment production.
9. Comment word cloud will allow the ContentReaders to see the gist of the comments before reading the content

Further advantages of various aspects will be apparent from the ensuing description and accompanying drawings.

SUMMARY

We provide a method to remove the association of Comment production from the content that is being commented on. Particular embodiments relate to a Comment system which exists separately from the Content that is being commented on and stores the user Comment in a data store in association with an identifier for the Content and categories characterizing the CommentAuthor, the Comments, and secondary characterizations of the CommentAuthor by CommentReaders.

DRAWINGS

No figures are included.

DEFINITIONS

Comment: Comment.

CommentReader: Reader of Comment

CommentAuthor: Author of Comment

Content: Content or object being commented on or rated such as a web page, photograph, video, podcast, product, etc.

ContentLink: Way to access content, for example, a clickable link on a Google search page, a clickable button, etc.

ContentReader: Reader of Content

CommentReader: Reader of Comment

ContentID: Preferably Unique ID representing Content, such as a URL, a product ID, a QR code, a bar code, a performance time and place, etc.

ContentRating: Includes information such as Thumbs-up (or Likes) and Thumbs-down clicks, ratings on scales of, for example, relevance, originality, etc.

CommentAuthorID: ID representing Comment author.

CommentAuthorProfile: Profile information about CommentAuthor, including one or more attributes such as unique name, password, profession or professional

group, education, interest(s). Authentication (user name and password) can also be done via other websites such as Gmail or Facebook.

InferredCommentAuthorProfile: information about CommentAuthor inferred from comment history including, for example, ContentRatings, Comments sentiment analysis, Comments language (or intellectual) level analysis, and CommentAuthorID ratings of previous comments.

PreferredComments: Comments which are selected from CommentAuthorProfile information or from InferredCommentAuthorProfile information or from full text searches including, for example, CommentAuthorProfile categories and ratings types.

CommentReaderID: ID representing comment reader. This may be the same person as the CommentAuthor.

CommentReaderProfile: Profile information about CommentReader, including one or more attributes such as unique name, password, profession or professional group, education, interest(s). Authentication (user name and password) can also be done via other websites such as Gmail or Facebook. Information includes PreferredComments and CommentRatings.

CommentRating: Includes information such as Thumbs-up (or Likes) and Thumbs-down clicks, ratings on scales of, for example, relevance, originality, bias, veracity, etc.

CommentAuthorIDRating: Includes information such as the average CommentRating for a CommentAuthor for a variety of ContentIDs

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

Certain embodiments of the present invention include, but are not limited to:

First Embodiment

The invention is one in which Comments and/or associated ContentRatings are stored (cloud based or not) and administered relatively independently of the Content which includes one or more of:

- ContentID

- Comment
- ContentRating
- CommentAuthorID
- CommentAuthorProfile
- InferredCommentAuthorProfile
- ContentReaderID
- ContentReaderProfile
- CommentRating
- CommentAuthorIDRating

As the Content identified by the appropriate ContentID is accessed, the corresponding PreferredComments by the CommentReaderID are displayed with or without a filter, in order of expressed or inferred preference, or not in order, based on parameters including ContentRating and CommentAuthorProfile information and CommentAuthorID.

A particular implementation could be a plug-in into a web browser or other application for accessing Content. This plug-in software would monitor the ContentID(s) of the resource being viewed, or otherwise accessed, and display the selected Comments in an adjacent window. The appearance of the window could be user selected as to desktop location, focus, etc. A form would allow for Comment entry. Buttons by the comments might include Reply, Rate, Thumbs up, Thumbs down, etc. Another form would allow for CommentAuthorProfile entry.

Other particular implementations could be a memory resident program or application on the user computer, smart phone or other access device.

Second Embodiment

An implementation could be Comments presented in color where red means low CommentRating or ContentRating and green means a high rating.

Third Embodiment

An implementation could be a website overlay in which subdivided information remain in the original positions but with Content colored. For example, high rated Content could be colored in green and low rated Content in red.

Fourth Embodiment

An implementation could be a website overlay where low rated Content or Comments removed.

Fifth Embodiment

A word cloud or other word frequency graph displaying word frequency of the Comments conveniently placed, for example near the top of the Comments section or near the top of the Content.

All of the embodiments can have information stored in a variety of structures including tables, databases, etc.

Sixth Embodiment

The ContentRating appearing near the ContentLink or as a color of the ContentLink or by removing ContentLinks with low ContentRatings.

Seventh Embodiment

An implementation could provide for CommentAuthor retain copyright of the Comment.

CLAIMS: We claim:

What is claimed is:

1. A method implemented on a computer system, comprising:

One or more processors; and

One or more memory devices coupled to the processors comprising data storage and instructions that are executable by the processors, the processors being collectively operable when executing the instructions to:

Receive a request to store the ContentRatings associated with the Content hosted by a third-party system,

Wherein the request comprises one or more of a ContentID, ContentRating, CommentAuthorID, CommentAuthorRating, a CommentAuthorProfile, an InferredCommentAuthorProfile.

2. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein providing the rating allows the CommentReader to add an optional comment or explanation of the rating.
3. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the CommentReader can filter Comments, ContentRatings and CommentRatings according to differing rating scales.
4. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the CommentAuthor may rate and Comment on other Comments relating to the same Content.
5. The apparatus as recited in claim 1 wherein:

The request received is to access PreferredComments associated with the ContentID and/or CommentReaderID.

6. A method as recited in claim 5 wherein the CommentReader may rate the Comments returned according CommentReader selected scales and the CommentAuthor may return an additional Comment relating to the Comment.
7. A method as recited in claim 5 wherein the CommentReader may filter application of the ratings according to the CommentAuthorID, CommentAuthorRatings CommentAuthorProfile and/or InferredCommentAuthorProfile.

- 8.** A method as recited in claim 5 wherein the CommentReader may apply the relevant ratings in a graphic manner such as color shading directly to the Content presentation to the ContentReader, so that highly rated Content appear distinctive from low rated Content.
- 9.** A method as recited in claim 5 wherein the ContentReader may block Content associated with a low Content rating according to user selected thresholds and rating criteria.

ABSTRACT

Several inventions are disclosed to organize Comments separately from the Content provided system.