PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

PCT To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY **EXAMINING AUTHORITY** (PCT Rule 66) Date of mailing (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference **REPLY DUE** within months/days from the above date of mailing International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Applicant The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority: 1. is is not considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority. 2. This (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; Box No. V citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion. See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority When? to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e). How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 55.3 and 66.8. Also For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6. For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion. 4. The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: Name and mailing address of the IPEA/ Authorized officer Facsimile No. Telephone No.

Box N	lo. I	Basis of the opinion
1. W	Vith r	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
		the international application in the language in which it was filed.
		a translation of the international application into which is the language of a
		translation furnished for the purposes of:
		international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
		publication of the international application (Rule 12.4(a)).
		international preliminary examination (Rules 55.2(a) and/or 55.3(a) and (b)).
W	hich	regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of <i>(replacement sheets have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as inally filed."):</i>
L		the international application as originally filed/furnished
[the description:
		pages as originally filed/furnished
		pages received by this Authority on
		pages received by this Authority on
[the claims:
		Nos as originally filed/furnished
		Nos as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
		Nos received by this Authority on
		Nos received by this Authority on
		the drawings:
		pages as originally filed/furnished
		pages received by this Authority on
	_	pages received by this Authority on
L		a sequence listing - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.
3.		The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:
		the description, pages
		the claims, Nos.
		the drawings, sheets/figs
		the sequence listing (specify):
4.		This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments listed below had not been made, since either they are considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, or they were not accompanied by a letter indicating the basis for the amendments in the application as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rules 70.2(c) and (c- <i>bis</i>)):
		the description, pages
		the claims, Nos.
		the drawings, sheets/figs
		the sequence listing (specify):
5. T		This opinion has been established:
		taking into account the rectification of an obvious mistake authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 66.1(d- <i>bis</i>)).
		without taking into account the rectification of an obvious mistake authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 66.4 <i>bis</i>).
6.		Supplementary international search report(s) from Authority(ies)

Box No. II	Priority
1. 1	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the failure to furnish within the prescribed time imit the requested:
[copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 66.7(a)).
[translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 66.7(b)).
ii	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rule 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additio	nal observations, if necessary:

Box No.	III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
	tions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially le have not been examined in respect of:
	the entire international application.
	claims Nos.
becau	
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos.
	are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):
	the claims, or said claims Nos are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed <i>(specify)</i> :
	no international search report has been established for said claims Nos.
	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:
	furnish a sequence listing complying with WIPO Standard ST.26, and such listing was not available to the International
	Preliminary Examining Authority in the form, language and manner acceptable to it.
	pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13 <i>ter</i> .1(a) and 13 <i>ter</i> .2.
	See Supplemental Box for further details.

Box No.	IV Lack of unity of invention
1.	In response to the invitation (Form PCT/IPEA/405) to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
	restricted the claims.
	paid additional fees.
	paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee.
	paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid.
	neither restricted the claims nor paid additional fees.
2.	This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with for the following reasons and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees:
2 0	convertes this emission has been established in second of the full second of the interview
3. Con	sequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
	all parts.
	the parts relating to claims Nos

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

	der Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, in ns supporting such statement	ventive step and industrial applicability;
1. Statement		
Novelty (N)	Claims	YES
	Claims	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	YES
	Claims	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

Box No. VI Certain documents cited 1. Certain published documents (Rule 70.10) Application No. Publication date Filing date Priority date (valid claim) Patent No. (day/month/year) (day/month/year) (day/month/year) 2. Non-written disclosures (Rule 70.9) Date of written disclosure Kind of non-written disclosure Date of non-written disclosure referring to non-written disclosure (day/month/year) (*day/month/year*)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE	
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY	

International application No.

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing	
Continuation of Box No. I, item 2:	
 With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the internation invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of a sequence listing: 	nal application and necessary to the claimed
a. forming part of the international application as filed.	
b furnished subsequent to the international filing date for the purposes of international filing date for t	national search and/or examination,
accompanied by a statement to the effect that the sequence listing international application as filed.	g does not go beyond the disclosure in the
c. furnished to this Authority as an amendment under PCT Article 34 on	
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the in claimed invention, this opinion has been established to the extent that a meaning Standard ST.26 compliant sequence listing.	
3. Additional comments:	

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Supplemental Box) (July 2022)

Supplemental Box

In case **the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.** Continuation of: TY