

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference P02553PCT		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/JP2006/312785	International filing date (day/month/year) 27.06.2006	Priority date (day/month/year) 28.06.2005
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
Applicant KONAMI DIGITAL ENTERTAINMENT CO., LTD.		

1. This 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
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; 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

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Date of completion of this opinion	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.		Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2006/312785

Box No. I	Basis of this opinion
1.	<p>With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the international application in the language in which it was filed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rule 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).</p>
2.	<p>With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:</p> <p>a. type of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a sequence listing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> table(s) related to the sequence listing</p> <p>b. format of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> on paper</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in electronic form</p> <p>c. time of filing/furnishing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> contained in the international application as filed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> filed together with the international application in electronic form</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search</p>
3.	<p><input type="checkbox"/> In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.</p>
4.	<p>Additional comments:</p>

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No. PCT/JP2006/312785
--

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-11	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-11	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-11	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP 2005-6913 A (Namco Ltd.), 13 January 2005, Full text; Figs. 1 to 13</p> <p>Document 2: JP 2003-181147 A (Square Co., Ltd.), 02 July 2003, paragraph 0078; Fig. 10 & US 2003/0134678 A1 & EP 1319432 A2</p> <p>Document 3: JP 2004-237003 A (Namco Ltd.), 26 August 2004, paragraph 0050</p> <p>Document 4: JP 2003-281554 A (Yamaha Corp.), 03 October 2003, Full text; Figs. 1 to 6</p> <p>Document 5: JP 2002-228458 A (Aisan AW Co., Ltd.), 14 August 2002, paragraphs 0022 to 0032; Figs. 4 to 6</p> <p>The inventions of claims 1, 3, and 9-11 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1 cited in the ISR and document 2 cited in the ISR. Use of the configuration for sending messages in sequence from game server device 200 to each video game unit 100, described in document 2, in the invention described in document 1 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.</p> <p>The inventions of claims 2 and 4-6 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1 and document 2 cited in the ISR and document 3 cited in the ISR. Use of the configuration in which client functions and server functions are both provided on one of the client terminals, described in document 3, in the invention described in document 1 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.</p>			

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V.2

The invention of claim 7 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1, document 2, and document 4 cited in the ISR.

Use of the configuration for updating only the required part, described in document 4, in the invention described in document 1 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.

The invention of claim 8 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1, document 2, and document 5 cited in the ISR.

Incorporation of the rounding processing, described in document 5, for the purpose of deforming an image in the invention described in document 1 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.