



Atty. Dkt. No. 016777/0454

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: **Indu J. ISAACS**
Title: **GLP-2 Formulations**
Appl. No.: **09/750,022**
Filing Date: **December 29, 2000**
Examiner: **C. Kam**
Art Unit: **1653**

#12/B
JMK
7/11/03
RECEIVED
JUL 11 2003
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

AMENDMENT AND REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the *Non-Final* Office Action mailed on February 5, 2003, the due date for response having been extended three months to August 5, 2003, Applicant submits the following Amendment and Reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111.

Applicants concurrently file herewith a Petition for Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), with provision for the required fee, to extend the period for response for three months, up to and including August 5, 2003. If additional fees are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

07/10/2003 CHUYEN 00000149 09750022

02 FC:1201 84.00 OP
03 FC:1202 18.00 OP

IN THE CLAIMS:

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, please substitute for claims 1, 14, 15, and 32 the following rewritten version of the same claims, as amended. The changes are shown explicitly in the attached "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made".

- B¹
1. (Amended) A glucagon-like peptide-2 (GLP-2) formulation comprising:
 - (a) a medically useful amount of a naturally occurring GLP-2 peptide or an analog thereof;
 - (b) a phosphate buffer in an amount sufficient to adjust the pH of the formulation to a physiologically tolerable level;
 - (c) L-histidine; and
 - (d) a bulking agent selected from the group consisting of mannitol and sucrose.

14. (Amended) The GLP-2 formulation of claim 13, wherein the GLP-2 peptide has the sequence of a GLP-2 species from an animal selected from the group consisting of a primate, rat, mouse, porcine species, oxine species, bovine species, degu, hamster, guinea pig, fish, chicken, and human.

B²

15. (Amended) The GLP-2 formulation of claim 14, wherein the GLP-2 peptide is h(Gly²)GLP-2.

B³

32. The GLP-2 formulation of claim 31, wherein the GLP-2 is h(Gly²)GLP-2.

Please add the following new claim.

- B⁴
55. (NEW) A GLP-2 formulation comprising:
 - (a) a medically useful amount of a naturally occurring GLP-2 peptide or an analog thereof;
 - (b) a phosphate buffer in an amount sufficient to adjust the pH of the formulation to a physiologically tolerable level;
 - (c) L-histidine in an amount sufficient to stabilize the formulation; and
 - (d) a bulking agent selected from the group consisting of mannitol and sucrose.

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

By this amendment, claims 1, 14, 15, and 32 are amended and claim 55 is added. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-55 will be pending.

Exemplary support for the amendments to claims 1, 14, 15, and 32 is found throughout the specification. *See* page 1, line 20. Exemplary support for claim 55 is found on page 2, lines 24-32. Claim 55 is added to more clearly define claim scope.

Because the foregoing amendments to not add new matter, entry thereof by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

It is acknowledged that the Examiner notes that claims 36-42 are free of the prior art and that claims 23-30, 32-35, 47, and 48 would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Rejection Of Claims 1-10, 22, And 49-54 As Being Allegedly Obvious Over Knudsen et al. In View Of Makino et al.

Claims 1-10, 22, and 49-54 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being allegedly obvious over Knudsen et al. (WO 99/43361) (“Knudsen”) in view of Makino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,985,244) (“Makino”). The Examiner asserts that although Knudsen fails to disclose using histidine as a stabilizing agent in a pharmaceutical composition, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because Makino disclose using 5% (w/v%) of histidine as a stabilizing agent in a vaccine composition. Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

A proper rejection for obviousness under § 103 requires consideration of two factors: (1) whether the prior art would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art that they should make the claimed composition, or device, or carry out the claimed process, and

(2) whether the prior art would also have revealed that in making or carrying out the claimed invention, those of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation of success. Both the suggestion and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, and not in the applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 493, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the following reasons.

1. There is no Motivation to Combine the Teachings of Makino and Knudsen

There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited prior art to combine the teachings of Makino with the teachings of Knudsen to obtain the claimed invention because the two references are directed to different types of compositions which are not interchangeable, and which have different properties and characteristics.

Specifically, Knudsen teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising a GLP-2 derivative of improved solubility and/or stability. GLP-2 and derivatives thereof are peptides. In contrast, Makino teaches a stabilized live attenuated vaccine. A peptide is defined as "two or more amino acids joined by a peptide bond" (see attached definition from <http://www.genome.gov/glossary.cfm?key=peptide>). In contrast, a vaccine is defined as "a suspension of attenuated or killed microorganisms (bacteria, viruses or rickettsiae), administered for the prevention, amelioration, or treatment of infectious diseases" (see attached definition from <http://cancerweb.ncl.ac.uk/cgi-bin/omd?vaccine>).

While a peptide is a compound formed by joining amino acids, a vaccine comprises complex attenuated or killed organisms. Since a peptide is entirely different from a vaccine, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not expect the stability of a vaccine in a solution to have any bearing on the stability of a peptide in the same solution. Therefore, the cited references lack the requisite teaching or suggestion to motivate a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references. Moreover, the Examiner has failed to provide any reasoning to support the assertion that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the cited art to obtain the claimed invention.

2. One of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Have had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Obtaining the Claimed Invention by Combining the Teachings of Makino and Knudsen

A person of ordinary skill in the art would not have had a reasonable expectation of success in adding a stabilizing agent known to stabilize vaccine solutions to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a GLP-2 peptide derivative. As discussed above, a peptide is entirely different from a vaccine. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not expect that a stabilizer known to stabilize vaccines would also stabilize a pharmaceutical composition comprising a GLP-2 peptide derivative.

In particular, Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to page 5 of the March 8, 2002, Office Action for the present application where the Examiner stated that Knudsen and Makino do not teach the claimed invention because "it is not known whether histidine can stabilize GLP-2 or its analogs in the GLP-2 formulation."

For the above reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the rejection of the claims over Knudsen in view of Makino. Withdrawal of this ground for rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Rejection Of Claims 11, 12, And 31 As Being Allegedly Obvious Over Knudsen In View Of Makino, And Further In View Of Hora et al.

Claims 11, 12, and 31 are rejected by the Examiner as being allegedly unpatentable over Knudsen in view of Makino, as applied to claims 1-10 above, and further in view of Hora et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,997,856) ("Hora"). Applicant respectfully traverses this ground for rejection.

As discussed above, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the rejection of the claims over Knudsen in view of Makino. Hora does not remedy the deficiencies of Knudsen and Makino. Therefore, claims 11, 12, and 31 are not obvious over Knudsen in view of Makino and further in view of Hora. Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.