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1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.
   
   In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

   - [x] Box No. I Basis of the report
   - [ ] Box No. II Priority
   - [x] 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 Article 35(2) 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

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).
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Applicant
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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 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 66.1bis(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/ISA220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA220.
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Form PCT/ISA237 (Cover Sheet) (July 2009)
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. 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. 1-4

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. 1-4 are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):

see separate sheet

☐ no international search report has been established for the whole application or 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 on paper 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 a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ furnish a sequence listing in electronic form 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 a form and manner acceptable to it.

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

☒ See Supplemental Box for further details
Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

**Clear and Complete Disclosure of Claimed Invention under Article 5 PCT**

The subject matter of each claim must be supported by the description and drawings “in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for the invention to be carried out by a person skilled in the art”.

The disclosure of the claimed invention is considered sufficiently clear and complete only if it provides information which is sufficient to allow the invention to be carried out by a person skilled in the art as of the international filing date, without undue experimentation. This requirement is not achieved by the present application whereby there is insufficient information pertaining to the modus operandi of the device enabling third parties to accurately reproduce such a device and the means by which it purportedly achieves its stated detection possibilities is also lacking from the description and claims.

Furthermore the claims consist of unclear terms which have no functional or technical relevance to known methods of detection. For instance the terms “general detection” “free moving indicator” and “human body attributes” used in the claims are so vague and unclear, leaving the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the technical features to which these terms refer, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-matter of said claims unclear under Article 6 PCT.

Furthermore, claim 1 attempts to define the detection capabilities of the device by virtue of its ability to accurately differentiate between solids, liquids, gases, organic or inorganic, viruses, bacteria, fungi and plant diseases, but nowhere throughout the description is the reader accurately and clearly informed as to how such a differentiating detection can be achieved and how to reproducibly achieve such a detection with said device, therefore the description undoubtedly lacks a clear and complete disclosure of the claimed invention and cannot be allowed under Article 5 PCT.