

**PATENT COOPERATION TREATY**

**PCT**

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY**

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>PR11-10084</b>	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b>		See item 4 below
International application No. <b>PCT/JP2011/065039</b>	International filing date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) <b>30 June 2011 (30.06.2011)</b>	Priority date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) <b>30 June 2010 (30.06.2010)</b>	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) <b>See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237</b>			
Applicant <b>Rakuten, Inc.</b>			

<p>1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 8 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p>In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.</p>																								
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table> <p>4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																						

	Date of issuance of this report <b>12 February 2013 (12.02.2013)</b>
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer  <b>Yukari Nakamura</b>
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	e-mail: pt07.pct@wipo.int

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)	<b>27.09.2011</b>
-------------------------------------	-------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>PR11-10084</b>	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below
--	--

International application No. <b>PCT/JP2011/065039</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>30.06.2011</b>	Priority date (day/month/year) <b>30.06.2010</b>
---	---	---

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
**G06Q30/00 (2006.01)**

Applicant  
**Rakuten, Inc.**

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/JP2011/065039

Box No. I      Basis of this opinion

1. With 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)).
2.  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 43*bis*.1(a))
3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of a sequence listing filed or furnished:
  - a. (means)
    - on paper
    - in electronic form
  - b. (time)
    - in the international application as filed
    - together with the international application in electronic form
    - subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
4.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing 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.
5. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2011/065039

<b>Box No. V</b>	<b>Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</b>		
1. Statement	Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1-15</u>	YES
		Claims _____	NO
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>6, 8-9</u>	YES
		Claims <u>1-5, 7, 10-15</u>	NO
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-15</u>	YES
		Claims _____	NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP 2002-269428 A (Sharp Corp.), 20 September 2002, claim 1; paragraphs [0046], [0047], and [0093]</p> <p>Document 2: JP 2006-344219 A (International Business Machines Corp.), 21 December 2006, claim 1; paragraphs [0040]-[0044] and [0051]-[0055] &amp; US 2006/0277118 A1 &amp; CN 1877630 A</p> <p>Document 3: JP 2008-225629 A (Ricoh Co., Ltd.), 25 September 2008, claims 1 and 4-5; paragraphs [0073]-[0075]</p> <p>Document 4: JP 2003-22395 A (Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), 24 January 2003, paragraphs [0133] to [0143]</p> <p>Document 5: JP 2002-334201 A (Spreme System Consulting Corp.), 22 November 2002, claim 1; paragraphs [0070]-[0076]</p> <p>Document 6: JP 2002-352327 A (Toshiba Tec Corp.), 06 December 2002, claim 5; paragraphs [0061] and [0068]</p> <p>Document 7: JP 2007-122323 A (The Japan Research Institute, Ltd.), 17 May 2007, paragraph</p>			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2011/065039

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

[0036]

Document 8: JP 2005-352929 A (Ricoh Co., Ltd.), 22 December 2005, paragraphs [0026]-[0030], [0036], and [0047]

Document 9: JP 2006-4335 A (Pia Corp.), 05 January 2006, paragraph [0022]

Document 10: WO 2008/114358 A1 (Mikio HARA), 25 September 2008, pages 9 and 10

Claims 1-5, 7, and 12-15

The invention as in claims 1-5, 7, and 12-15 does not involve an inventive step in the light of documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. Document 1 discloses an electronic transaction system in which a utilization terminal device operated by a user and a product purchase order receiving management server constituting a service site that receives product purchase requests from users are connected via a network, wherein the user inputs information to purchase a certain product at the utilization terminal device, and a product purchase request pertaining to that product is transmitted to the product purchase order receiving management server, the product purchase order receiving management server transmits to the utilization terminal device special information for the user when there is a product with a cheaper purchase price or better quality/material than the product the purchaser wanted to purchase, instead of the product pertaining to the product purchase request, with this information corresponding to a product pertaining to the product purchase request transmitted from the utilization terminal device, the user uses the utilization terminal device to receive the reward information transmitted from the product purchase order receiving management server, inputs whether or

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2011/065039

**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**

not to use the reward represented by that reward information at the utilization terminal device, and transmits to the product purchase order receiving management server information indicating whether or not the user will use the reward as represented by those input contents, and the product purchase order receiving management server receives the reward use information transmitted from the utilization terminal device.

Document 2 cited in the ISR discloses the technical concept of making it possible for a user to select between the offer of a product selected by the user and a discount offer including another product selected by a vendor when purchasing a product.

Thus, a person skilled in the art could easily use the technical concept disclosed in document 2 cited in the ISR when performing the product purchase of document 1.

Claim 6

The invention as in claim 6 is not disclosed in any of the documents cited in the ISR, and would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art.

None of the documents discloses the feature of the invention as in claim 6, wherein process conditions satisfied in the process of satisfying reward application conditions are retained for each of the rewards, and if reward application conditions are not satisfied and the process conditions are satisfied, a different product is extracted, whereas due to said feature, the invention as in claim 6 achieves the advantageous effect that it is possible for the user to know the reward application conditions applied if the user purchases the different product, so it is possible to reduce the possibility of the user completely overlooking the reward, and to increase the degree of satisfaction of the user when

**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**

the reward is applied.

Claim 8

The invention as in claim 8 is not disclosed in any of the documents cited in the ISR, and would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art.

None of the documents discloses the feature of the invention as in claim 8, wherein there is provided a substitute relationship determination means which operates such that if one product remains from a group of desired products and a history of erasing the products included in the same genre or a related genre as that one product has been retained, products included in the group of the desired product are determined to be in a substitute relationship with one another, whereas due to said feature, the invention as in claim 8 achieves the advantageous effect that it is possible to increase the sales of the merchant selling the product.

Claim 9

The invention as in claim 9 is not disclosed in any of the documents cited in the ISR, and would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art.

None of the documents discloses the feature of the invention as in claim 9, wherein there is provided a substitute relationship determination means which operates such that a plurality of products included in the same genre or related genre included in a group of favorite products within a predetermined time period are determined to be in a substitute relationship with one another, whereas due to said feature, the invention as in claim 9 achieves the advantageous effect that it is possible to increase the sales of the merchant selling the product.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2011/065039

**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**

Claims 10-11

The invention as in claims 10-11 does not involve an inventive step in the light of documents 1-3 cited in the ISR.

Document 3 cited in the ISR discloses the technical concept that, when purchasing a product, if a product is a product that can be offered as similar to that product on the basis of inter-product relationships before and after replacement purchases in product purchase history groups extracted by a similar customer purchase history extraction unit and if the product before the replacement purchase is used across a longer time period than the time period designated in advance, that pre-replacement-purchase product is detected, the number of product purchase histories is compared, and products with a high number thereof are presented as recommended products.

Thus, a person skilled in the art could easily use the technical concept disclosed in document 3 cited in the ISR when performing the product purchase of document 1.