

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**
(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/HU2018/000002

International filing date (day/month/year)
26.01.2018

Priority date (day/month/year)
26.01.2017

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
INV. A63F13/90 A63F13/5255 G06F1/16 H04N5/64 A63F13/211

Applicant
HOFFMANN, DANIEL

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 43*bis*.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 usually 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 66.1*bis*(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:




European Patent Office
P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Date of completion of
this opinion

see form
PCT/ISA/210

Authorized Officer

Telephone No. +31 70 340-0



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 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:
 - 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 13ter.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 13ter.1(a)).
 - on paper or in the form of an image file (Rule 13ter.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:

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. 9-12, 21-26

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

no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 9-12, 21-26

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

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. 1-8, 13-20

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)	Yes: Claims	<u>3-8, 15-20</u>
	No: Claims	<u>1, 2, 13, 14</u>
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	<u>3-8, 15-20</u>
	No: Claims	<u>1, 2, 13, 14</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-8, 13-20</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Reference is made to the following document:

- D1 Anonymous: "[Solved] 4:3 Resolution on Widescreen Help",
 , 30 September 2016 (2016-09-30), XP055469680,
 Retrieved from the Internet:
 URL: <https://www.supermariobrosx.org/forums/viewtopic.php?t=16754>
 [retrieved on 2018-04-23]

Re Item IV.

1 Unity of Invention - Rule 13 PCT

1.1 This International Searching Authority found multiple groups of inventions in this international application, as follows:

a) Claims 1 to 8, 13 to 20: A method for enhancing an interactive multimedia experience, where a content is presented on a 16:9 widescreen display, the sides of which are masked such that a 4:3 viewing window remains, where upon user input, display and mask are mechanically moved such that different parts of the display become visible.

b) Claims 9 to 10 and 21 to 22: A method for enhancing an interactive multimedia experience, where a content is presented on a 16:9 widescreen display, the sides of which are masked such that a 4:3 viewing window remains, where a user's head or eye movement is detected as input signal and used to move the masking area.

c) Claims 11 to 12 and 23 to 24: A method for enhancing an interactive multimedia experience, where a content is presented on a 16:9 widescreen display, the sides of which are masked such that a 4:3 viewing window remains, where a the displayed content is magnified using a fresnel lens.

d) Claims 25 and 26: A method for enhancing an interactive multimedia experience, where a content is presented on a 16:9 widescreen display, the sides of which are masked such that a 4:3 viewing window remains, where the displayed content can be rotated based on user input using a gyroscopic sensor.

1.2 XP055469680 is considered to represent the closest prior art at hand and discloses:

A method for enhancing an interactive multimedia experience, where a

content is presented on a 16:9 widescreen display, the sides of which are masked such that a 4:3 viewing window remains (The first blog post describes a user displaying content in a 4:3 format on a 16:9 widescreen display. The blog post is from supermariobosx.org, therefore implicitly the displayed multimedia content is moved in two directions upon user input.). Thereby this document is anticipating claims 1 and 2.

- 1.3 Therefore, the differences between the disclosure of D1 and the multiple inventions can be defined as follows:

The subject matter of claim 3 differs from the closest prior art at hand in that upon user input, display and mask are mechanically moved such that different parts of the display become visible.

The subject matter of claim 9 differs from the closest prior art at hand in that a user's head or eye movement is detected as input signal and used to move the masking area.

The subject matter of claim 11 differs from the closest prior art at hand in that the displayed content is magnified using a fresnel lens.

The subject matter of claim 25 differs from the closest prior art at hand in that the displayed content can be rotated based on user input using a gyroscopic sensor.

- 1.4 Starting from the subject matter disclosed in D1, the following problems are solved:

Claim 3 solves the problem of mechanically masking a part of the display device.

Claim 9 solves the problem of using head or eye movement as user input.

Claim 11 solves the problem of magnifying the display.

Claim 25 solves the problem of rotating the displayed content.

- 1.5 The special technical feature (STF) of claim 3 is the mechanic movement of display or mask.

The special technical feature (STF) of claim 9 is the head or eye movement as user input.

The special technical feature (STF) of claim 11 is the fresnel lens.

The special technical feature (STF) of claim 25 is the gyroscopic sensor.

- 1.6 Since the STF are neither identical nor corresponding (i.e. they cannot function in an equivalent, complementary or cooperative manner with the STF of another invention or are specially adapted to a STF of another invention), there are no same or corresponding special technical features shared by all independent claims of the invention.
- 1.7 Therefore, the multiple groups of claims are not linked by common or corresponding special technical features and define multiple different inventions not linked by a single general inventive concept.
- 1.8 The application, hence does not meet the requirements of Unity of Invention as defined in Rules 13.1, 13.2 PCT. Accordingly, the partial search report has been drafted for the first invention (claims 1 to 8, 13 to 20).

Re Item V:

2 Novelty

2.1 Independent Claim 1

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of **claim 1** is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A method for enhancing a multimedia experience (The blog posts are from supermariobrosx.org, which is a forum for discussing a video game which is also a multimedia experience.), wherein at least one multimedia content is stored in a storage, a selected content of the stored multimedia content is presented on the display, and during presentation, the display is influenced by user input where the influence affects the positioning of the displayed multimedia content on the display (implicit), characterized in that the multimedia content is displayed on a wide screen display, which is masked by a narrowing mask, while the display or displayed content is moved along a coordinate in two possible directions by user inputs in one or another direction. (The first blog post describes a user displaying content in a 4:3

format on a 16:9 widescreen display. The blog post is from supermariobosx.org, therefore implicitly the displayed multimedia content is moved in two directions upon user input.)

2.2 Independent Claim 13

The same objections as for claim 1 apply mutatis mutandis also for **claim 13** (see passages cited for claim 1).

The subject matter of independent claim 13 is therefore not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.3 Dependent Claims 2, 14

Document D1 also discloses the additional feature of dependent claims 2, 14 (the first blog post explicitly talks about displaying 4:3 content on a widescreen display which typically has an aspect ratio of 16:9).

The subject matter of dependent claims 2, 14 is therefore not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.4 Dependent claims 3 to 8 and 15 to 20

While movable displays are known from the prior art, see for example document D1 (paragraph 7), a mechanical movement of display or mask in this context is not known from the prior art. Therefore dependent claims 3 and 15 and all claims dependent on these claims are novel over the prior art. In view of the examiner, a mechanical movement of mask or display would not be obvious to the skilled person and therefore involve an inventive step.