

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year) 15 March 2017	
Applicant's or agent's file reference HA 4936-03WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/EP2016/079371	International filing date (day/month/year) 01 December 2016
Priority date (day/month/year) 01 December 2015	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC B22C 1/20(2006.01)i	
Applicant HÜTTENES-ALBERTUS CHEMISCHE WERKE GESELLSCHAFT...	

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 and 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.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/	Date of completion of this opinion	Authorized officer
--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2016/079371

Box No. I 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 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:
 - a. forming part of the international application as filed:
 - in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file.
 - on paper or in the form of an image file.
 - b. furnished together with the international application under PCT Rule 13*ter*.1(a) for the purposes of international search only in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file.
 - c. furnished subsequent to the international filing date for the purposes of international search only:
 - in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file (Rule 13*ter*.1(a)).
 - on paper or in the form of an image file (Rule 13*ter*.1(b) and Administrative Instructions, Section 713).
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 forming part of 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/EP2016/079371

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application.

claims Nos. 1-20

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (*specify*):

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. 1-20 are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

See Supplemental Box

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 in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in the form and manner acceptable to it; or the sequence listing furnished did not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions.

furnish a sequence listing on paper or in the form of an image file complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in the form and manner acceptable to it; or the sequence listing furnished did not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions.

pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rule 13ter.1(a) or (b).

See Supplemental Box for further details.

Supplemental Box

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

Continuation of: **Box No. III**

See Supplemental Box for further information.

Box III**Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability**

No opinion will be established with respect to novelty or inventive step for claims 1-20 because the subjects of these claims are not supported by the description across the full scope thereof.

[1] Method claim 1, together with dependent claims 2-15, product claim 16 and use claims 17, 18 and 20

The description only supports a method for producing a feeder element for the foundry industry, in which the "*refractory substances*" according to claim 8, the "*density-reducing substances*" according to claim 6, and the "*hardenable fluid*" according to claim 5 are specified.

[2] Method claim 19

In addition to the lack of a restriction to the substances specifically mentioned in the description (see point 1), the method according to claim 19 no longer relates to a method for producing a feeder element for the foundry industry in the manner in which this is the subject matter of the present application, but instead relates very generally to the production of composite particles. Claim 19 thus also comprises, for example, pharmaceutical composite particles as are known from **D1** or **D2** or the fillers disclosed in **D3**.

[3] However, in the present state of the proceedings, subject matter for which protection is sought that is specified in accordance with points 1 and 2 appears to meet the requirements in respect of novelty and inventive step.