

Brazilian Patent and Trademark Office - INPI
Brazilian Technical Division of the Patent Cooperation Treaty -
DTPCT

Rua São Bento 1, 17º andar
20090-010 – Rio de Janeiro/RJ.

Cláudio Roberto Barbosa*
Eduardo Colonna Rosman
Elisabeth Kasznar Fekete*
Fabiano de Bem da Rocha **
Filipe da Cunha Leonardos
Gabriel Francisco Leonardos
Gustavo José Ferreira Barbosa
João Luis d'Orey Facco Vianna
Liz Starling
Nancy Satiko Caigawa*
Rafael Lacaz Amaral
Ricardo Cardoso Costa Boclin
Ronaldo M. Varella Gomes***
Tatiana Almeida Silveira

Mauricio Leonardos****

Re.: OXITENO S.A. INDÚSTRIA E COMÉRCIO
Patent Application - WIPO- N°. PCT/BR2015/050096
N/Ref.: PE2045

Adriana Loureiro José
Alexandre Magno de Lima
Alice Rayol Ramos Sandes
Aline Ferreira de Carvalho da Silva
Aline Melissa da Silva Forrester
Ana Carolina Lima do Nascimento
Ana Lúcia P. Roque
Anita Monika B. Cordeiro Guerra
Cinara Romanelli
Cintia da Silva Lima
Cyntia Penna Vieira
Daniela Alves Pedrosa
Diego Preza Monaco
Dulce Maria Mattos Farias
Fabio de Araujo Ottoni Ferreira
Flávia Tremura Polli Rodrigues*
Gabriela Faulhaber e Silva
Gigliola Dias Guimarães Dobbin
Gustavo Coutinho M. Bacalhau
Ísis Moret Souza
Jamile Rodrigues de Oliveira
Karina de Godoy Daiha
Laura Leite Marques
Livia Honório de Figueiredo
Luciana Yumi Hiane Minada
Lucio Carlos Signore Junior
Marcelo Mello Bezerra
Maria Claudia B. A. Souza
Maria Cláudia Sabatini
Michelle Melo da Silva
Monica Martins Patrizi
Mônica Simas Medeiros
Patrícia de Oliveira Lopes
Patrícia Schneider
Paulo R. Bianco dos Santos
Pedro Paulo Machado Vilhena Neto*
Péricles Madureira de Pinho Neto
Phillip Francisco de Azevedo Monteiro
Priscila Mayumi Kashiwabara*
Rafael Salomão S. R. Aguiar
Regis de Oliveira Schneider
Rodrigo Mourao Magalhaes
Sabrina Lattanzi Miranda
Stephen Jennings
Tarso Mesquita Machado
Thereza G. Curi Abranches
Tomaz Henrique Leonardos
Vivian de Melo Silveira

Dear Sirs/Madams,

We hereby refer to the Written Opinion issued by the Brazilian Patent and Trademark Office (INPI), as International Search Authority (ISA), which was sent on October 8, 2015.

Pursuant to Article 34 and Rules 43 *bis.* (a) (i) 54 *bis.*1 (a) (i), 66.1*bis.*b) and 66.8 of the PCT, the Applicant submits together with the **INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION APPLICATION**, attached herein, the remarks laid down below.

Charts IV and V – Remarks on the international application

On December 18, 2015, the Applicant submitted amendments to the specification, based on Article 19. With regard to these amendments, the Applicant clarifies that:

- Claims 1 and 9: They were amended to clearly and precisely define the claimed fluid compositions as free of this compound and, thus, they are totally different from the cited prior art.
- Claim 9: to better define and specify this claim, differentiating it from the indicated prior art, item a) was amended to make the number of polar solvent limited to only one, that is, formulation containing two, three or more polar solvents are not claimed by said claim.

The amendments submitted in the set of claims are based on the specification, including the examples laid down. Thus, no novel subject matter was added to the present application.

Considering the foregoing clarifications, the Applicant believes that the present application complies with the requirement of inventive step, because a person

* São Paulo Firm
** Porto Alegre Firm
*** Managing partner
**** Consultant

skilled in the art would not deem it obvious, based on the teachings of documents D1-D8, when taken alone or in combination, to attain the results achieved by the present invention.

To highlight the differences of the subject matter of the present invention in relation to the cited prior art documents, the Applicant submitted a new set of claims on December 8, 2015, which is submitted again herein together with new copies of the specification and of the abstract.

With the cited amendments, the Applicant believes to have proven that the prior art documents mentioned in the Search Report do not compromise either the novelty or the inventive step of the invention under examination.

Wherefore, based on Rule 66.4 (b) of the PCT, The Applicant respectfully request the re-examination of application N°. PCT/BR2014/050040, and expects a favorable opinion or the issuance of a second written opinion, should further clarifications be necessary.

Kind Regards,

KASZNAR LEONARDOS
Intellectual Property