
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. 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>2, 3, 5-14</u>
	No: Claims	<u>1, 4, 15</u>
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	<u>5-14</u>
	No: Claims	<u>1-4, 15</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-15</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

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

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 5 020 394 A (NAKAMURA TSUTOMU [JP] ET AL) 4 June 1991
(1991-06-04)

D2: WO 2015/018842 A1 (ELEMENT SIX LTD [IE]) 12 February 2015 (2015-02-12)

D3: GB 2 481 295 A (ELEMENT SIX LTD [IE]; ELEMENT SIX PRODUCTION PTY LTD [ZA]) 21 December 2011 (2011-12-21)

D4: WO 02/49801 A1 (DE BEERS IND DIAMOND [ZA]; FRIES ROBERT [ZA]; SIGALAS IACOVOS [ZA]) 27 June 2002 (2002-06-27)

2 Novelty, inventive step

2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(2) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1, 4, 15 is not new. Further, the present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(3) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 2, 3 is not inventive.

2.2 Claim 1, claim 15

Document D1 discloses a mill bit according to claim 1, and therefore a method of making a mill bit according to claim 15, wherein this document discloses (see D1, figure 2, Example 1) an elongate base body having a proximal end, a distal end, an outer surface, an internal bore that defines an inner surface,

one or more flutes (see figure 2, flutes between 3) formed on the outer surface that defines one or more teeth,

an abrasive coating (Example 1) on at least a portion of the outer surface, wherein the one or more flutes are free of the abrasive coating.

2 Claims 2-4

Dependent claims 2-4 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty (claim 4) or inventive step (claims 2, 3):

Claims 2, 3: the roughness as claimed in claim 2 and the grain size in the abrasive coating as claimed in claim 3 are only one of the possibilities that the skilled person would choose without exerting any inventive skill.

Claim 4: see D1, figure 3.

3 Claim 5

The combination of the features of dependent claim 5 seems to be is neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the available prior art. The reasons are as follows: no document of the available prior art neither disclose nor suggests a mill bit according to claim 1 wherein the one or more flutes are helical flutes.