

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

To:
RAPP, ROBERT J.
POLSINELLI LLP
Three Ambarcadero Center, Suite 2400
San Francisco, California
United States of America, 94111

Date of mailing <i>(day/month/year)</i>	29 May 2020 (29-05-2020)
--	--------------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference
ETII-058PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IB2020/052164

International filing date *(day/month/year)*
11 March 2020 (11-03-2020)

Priority date *(day/month/year)*
12 March 2019 (12-03-2019)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
IPC: **G16Z 99/00** (2019.01), **G06F 40/20** (2020.01), **G06Q 50/04** (2012.01)

Applicant
RADIANT TECHNOLOGIES INNOVATIONS 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 43*bis*.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 66.1*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/CA
Canadian Intellectual Property Office
Place du Portage I, C114 - 1st Floor, Box PCT
50 Victoria Street
Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0C9
Facsimile No.: 001-819-953-2476

Date of completion of this opinion

14 May 2020 (14-05-2020)

Authorized officer

Leslie Yeow (819) 639-8372

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(b))

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 in 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)	Claims 1-15	YES
	Claims NONE	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 6 and 13	YES
	Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-15	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-15	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document Cited

D1: US20140081754 A1, Gross, 20 March 2014 (20-03-2014)

Novelty & Inventive Step (D1)

Claims 1-15 are novel and comply with Article 33(2) of the PCT.

Claims 6 and 13 involve an inventive step and therefore comply with PCT Article 33(3).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, D1 fails to disclose that the recommendation concerns changing a cannabinoid potency of the cannabinoid-infused product, and wherein sending the recommendation to the recipient device associated with a manufacturer of the cannabinoid-infused product based on a rule regarding changes in cannabinoid potency.

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-15 lack an inventive step and thus fail to comply with Article 33(3) of the PCT.

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 15, D1 discloses a method for media-based product modification, the method comprising:

collecting data from one or more sources regarding one or more products (paragraph [0017]: a single item “Sony” may be associated with multiple topics/concepts, such as a reference to a particular product or service offered by such company (for example Vaio) a stock symbol for Sony, a reference to a key employee/officer of Sony, and the like);

identifying at least one of the products (paragraph [0018]: the natural language classifier/mapper 130 can recognize words/phrases within a search page, ad, post, etc., and correlate them to one or more topics/concepts; thus if a document contains the word Dell, the NL classifier can be taught to recognize such word as corresponding to such concepts as a particular brand name, a computer company, and the like);

evaluating one or more words from the collected data regarding the product (paragraphs [0018-0019]: the system understands that an individual reading articles about Porsches, Ferraris, etc, is probably interested in high end sports cars, luxury items, etc);

assigning a score to the product based on the evaluation of the one or more words (paragraphs [0008, 0021]: for example, one approach may use the product of (frequency of usage of the endorsement), with some normalization applied; this will result in an increase in score for older and more frequently used items); and

sending a recommendation to at least one recipient device associated with the identified product, the recommendation selected based on the score (paragraph [0005]: recommender system which evaluates multiple data sources is employed to generate more accurate and relevant predictions concerning data items and other users within a community).

D1 fails to explicitly disclose that said products are cannabinoid-infused products. However, as D1 discloses a generic recommender system, and also since recommender systems are well known in the art (paragraphs [0003-0005]), it would not involve an inventive step to apply the teachings of D1 to provide recommendations for a specific type of product.

Continued in Supplemental Box 1

Supplemental Box 1

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

Continuation of: Box No. V

Regarding claims 2 and 9, D1 fails to explicitly disclose that the recipient device is associated with at least one of a cultivator, a manufacturer, a distributor, or a retailer. However, as D1 discloses a generic recommender system without restriction on the use of the device (paragraph [0042]), it would not involve an inventive step to apply the teachings of D1 to a device in use by a cultivator, a manufacturer, a distributor, or a retailer.

Regarding claims 3 and 10, D1 discloses that the collected data includes one or more comments from a social media network, and the one or more words are identified from the one or more comments (paragraphs [0035-0040]).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, D1 discloses that evaluating the one or more words includes identifying that the one or more words are included in a first list of keywords in a set of recommendations (paragraphs [0018-0019]).

Regarding claims 5 and 12, D1 discloses generating the recommendation based on the first list of keywords being associated with the recommendation, and identifying the recipient device based on an identifier in the set of recommendations (paragraphs [0035-0040]).

Regarding claims 7 and 14, D1 discloses receiving a notification from the recipient device regarding implementation of the recommendation (paragraphs [0035-0040]).

Industrial Applicability

The subject matter of claims 1-15 is considered to be industrially applicable and thus complies with the requirements of PCT Article 33(4).