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Box No. 1  Basis of the 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 43bis.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:
Box No. IV  Lack of unity of invention

1. ☑ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
   - ☑ 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
   - ☐ not paid additional fees

2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
   - ☐ complied with
   - ☑ not complied with for the following reasons:
     
     see separate sheet

4. Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
   - ☐ all parts.
   - ☑ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-37

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes: Claims</th>
<th>No: Claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novelty (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-13, 15-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventive step (IS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial applicability (IA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet
Re Item V (2nd invention, cl. 14-37)

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

State of the art

Reference is made to the following document:


D1 discloses a composite comprising a network comprising a plurality of reinforcing fibers (see D1, [0035] and a matrix comprising polyimide fibers (see D1, [0028]) and polymeric binder fibers (see D1, [0034]), wherein the polymeric binder has a melt temperature lower than polyimide (see D1, [0036] - [0044]) and wherein the composite has a minimum degree of loft of greater or equal to three (see D1, example 2).

Thus, D1 discloses all features of claim 14 and therefor the subject-matter of claim 14 is not new.

Dependent claims

The subject-matter of the dependent claims is not inventive since it refers to well-known methods or a selection of parameters which appears to be an arbitrary choice since they are not linked to any unexpected effect.