Application No. Applicant(s				
Notice of Allowability	Examiner DIANA JOHANNSEN	Art Unit 1634	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) ON NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RICE of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313	OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this apport of the appropriate communication GHTS. This application is subject to	lication. If not will be mailed i	included n due course. <b>THIS</b>	
1. ☑ This communication is responsive to the Supplemental Amer ☐ A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under 37 CFR 1.130(b) was/		<u>f 7/19/13</u> .		
2. An election was made by the applicant in response to a restr requirement and election have been incorporated into this ac	-	e interview on	; the restriction	
3. The allowed claim(s) is/are 63-73,76-79 and 82. As a result of Prosecution Highway program at a participating intellectual please see <a href="http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/indegetator.com/patents/init_events/pph/init_ev&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;property office for the corresponding&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;g application. F&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;or more information,&lt;/td&gt;&lt;/tr&gt;&lt;tr&gt;&lt;td&gt;&lt;ul&gt; &lt;li&gt;4. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under Certified copies:&lt;/li&gt; &lt;li&gt;a) All b) Some *c) None of the:&lt;/li&gt; &lt;li&gt;1. Certified copies of the priority documents have&lt;/li&gt; &lt;li&gt;2. Certified copies of the priority documents have&lt;/li&gt; &lt;/ul&gt;&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;been received.&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;&lt;/td&gt;&lt;/tr&gt;&lt;tr&gt;&lt;td&gt;3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents of the pr&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;of this communication to file a reply c&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;&lt;/td&gt;&lt;td&gt;&lt;/td&gt;&lt;/tr&gt;&lt;tr&gt;&lt;td&gt;THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.  5 □ COPPECTED DRAWINGS (as " must<="" replacement="" sheets")="" td=""><td>ha suhmittad</td><td></td><td></td></a>	ha suhmittad			
<ul> <li>5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.</li> <li>including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date</li> </ul>				
Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.8 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the	34(c)) should be written on the drawing e header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d	gs in the front (i	not the back) of	
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BI attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FO	OLOGICAL MATERIAL must be sub	mitted. Note th	ie	
Attachment(s)  1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2. ☒ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date 0313; 0613; 0713  3. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material  4. ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date part of 20130718.  /Diana B. Johannsen/	5. ☑ Examiner's Amendn 6. ☑ Examiner's Stateme 7. ☐ Other			
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634				



Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	11/576,178	WOLFGANG ET AL.			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	DIANA JOHANNSEN	1634			
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):					
(1) <u>Diana Johannsen</u> .	(3)				
(2) <u>Jayme Torelli</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 19 July 2013.					
Type: 🛛 Telephonic 🔲 Video Conference 🔲 Personal [copy given to: 🗌 applicant [	applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes If Yes, brief description:	⊠ No.				
Issues Discussed □101 ☑112 □102 □103 □Others (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)					
Claim(s) discussed: <u>64 and 79</u> .					
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>NA</u> .					
Substance of Interview (For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc)					
The examiner contacted applicant's representative on 7/18/13 to discuss minor clarifying amendments to claims 64 and 79. Agreement was reached and an examiner's amendment was authorized on 7/19/13.					
Applicant recordation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.					
<b>Examiner recordation instructions</b> : Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.					
Attachment					
/Diana B. Johannsen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634					

Application No.

Applicant(s)



Application/Control Number: 11/576,178 Page 2

Art Unit: 1634

### **EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed June 10, 2013 and the interview concluding July 19, 2013. Claims 63-73, 76-79, and 82 are now allowed, subject to the examiner's amendment set forth below. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.126, claims 63-73, 76-79, and 82 will be renumbered as claims 1-16 in the issued patent; original claim numbering is employed in the examiner's amendment.

2. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Jayme M. Torelli on July 19, 2013.



Application/Control Number: 11/576,178 Page 3

Art Unit: 1634

## 3. The application has been amended as follows:

In claim 64, at line 7, after "extracted genomic DNA" insert—or mRNA--.

In claim 64, at line 9, after "having sequenced the" delete "amplified CYP2D6 DNA" and insert therefore—DNA sample--.

In claim 64, at line 10, delete "amplified DNA" and insert therefore—DNA sample--.

In claim 79, at line 2, after "metabolizer" delete ", therefore".



Application/Control Number: 11/576,178 Page 4

Art Unit: 1634

4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance. All of the claims as amended June 10, 2013 now require steps in which the CYP2D6 genotype of a particular type of patient is assayed or has been assayed in a biological sample from the patient, and in which particular dosages of iloperidone are internally administered based on the genotype determined. As noted in the interview summary mailed April 17, 2013, applicant's arguments of March 20, 2013 were found persuasive with respect to the fact that prior art did not teach or suggest methods in which the dosages specified in the claims are administered based on a determination of the presence or absence of a CYP2D6 poor metabolizer genotype. Particularly, the teachings of the prior art are not sufficient to suggest that which is claimed in view of: (a) the teachings of the prior art as exemplified by Bertilsson et al (Br. J. Clin. Pharmacol. 53:111 [2002]; cited in IDS) regarding the need to establish for each type of substrate the effect of CYP2D6 genotype on drug metabolism, and the fact that the actual effect of a CYP2D6 poor metabolizer genotype on iloperidone metabolism was unknown at the time the invention was made; and (b) the unexpected benefit of reducing the risk of QTc prolongation by administering the specified reduced dosages of iloperidone to those with a CYP2D6 poor metabolizer genotype (as disclosed in the specification and discussed in the arguments of March 13, 2013).

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."



# DOCKET

# 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.

