



Change has propelled *inter partes* reviews (IPRs) since the process launched at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office's Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) in 2012.

In the period since March 2020, when we first published this practice guide, the IPR process has continued to mature and evolve.

Our monitoring, research, and analysis of large collections of quantitative and qualitative data in recent months have borne fruit. The observations and recommendations we share here are meant to position parties and practitioners at the leading edge of IPR practice by identifying noteworthy trends and best practices in IPR proceedings, even while the process—and outcomes—shift.

In this edition of the IPR Evolution guide, we offer two in-depth analyses based on IPR statistics, and a third analysis focused on a persistent and thorny issue relevant to every post-grant proceeding.

Authors



Tyler R. Bowen

Partner

TBowen@perkinscoie.com [602.351.8448](tel:602.351.8448)



Han-Wei (Harvey) Chen

Partner

HarveyChen@perkinscoie.com [650.838.4303](tel:650.838.4303)



Andrew T. Dufresne Ph.D.

Partner

ADufresne@perkinscoie.com [608.663.7492](tel:608.663.7492)



Emily J. Greb

Partner

EGreb@perkinscoie.com [608.663.7494](tel:608.663.7494)



Yang-Hsien Hsu

Practice Attorney

YHsu@perkinscoie.com [206.359.6881](tel:206.359.6881)



Maria A. Stubbings

Counsel

MStubbings@perkinscoie.com [202.654.1742](tel:202.654.1742)

Explore more in

[Intellectual Property Law](#) [Patent Litigation](#)