



SUPPLEMENTARY PARTIAL EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT

under Rule 62a and/or 63 of the European Patent Convention. This report shall be considered, for the purposes of subsequent proceedings, as the European search report

Application number:

EP 20 83 11 93

Classification of the application (IPC):
C07K 16/22, C12N 15/13, A61P 1/16, A61P 13/12

Technical fields searched (IPC):
C07K, A61K, A61P

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		
Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim
X	WO 2005087812 A1 (LUDWIG INST CANCER RES [US]; LICENTIA LTD [FI] ET AL.) 22 September 2005 (2005-09-22) * abstract * * page 15, line 6 - line 10 * * claim 27 * * page 95, line 8 - line 17 * * page 21, line 26 - line 33 * * page 17, line 7 - line 23 * * page 9, line 4 - line 15 *	1-13
A	BORKHAM-KAMPHORST ET AL: "Pro-fibrogenic potential of PDGF-D in liver fibrosis" <i>JOURNAL OF HEPATOLOGY, ELSEVIER, AMSTERDAM, NL</i> , 03 May 2007 (2007-05-03), vol. 46, no. 6, DOI: 10.1016/J.JHEP.2007.01.029, ISSN: 0168-8278, pages 1064-1074, XP022068182 * abstract * * page 1072, right-hand column, paragraph 3 *	1-13
A	OGAWA S ET AL: "Anti-PDGF-B monoclonal antibody reduces liver fibrosis development" <i>HEPATOLOGY RESEARCH, AMSTERDAM, NL; BIOSCIENCES INFORMATION SERVICE, PHILADELPHIA, PA, US</i> , 01 November 2010 (2010-11-01), vol. 40, DOI: 10.1111/J.1872-034X.2010.00718.X, ISSN: 1386-6346, pages 1128-1141, XP002721268 * abstract * * page 1138, right-hand column, paragraph 1 - page 1139, left-hand column, paragraph 1 *	1-13
A	TANEDA SEKIKO ET AL: "Obstructive Uropathy in Mice and Humans : Potential Role for PDGF-D in the Progression of Tubulointerstitial Injury" <i>JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEPHROLOGY US</i> 01 October 2003 (2003-10-01), vol. 14, no. 10, DOI: 10.1097/01.ASN.0000089828.73014.C8, ISSN: 1046-6673, pages 2544-2555, XP093060450 * page 2551, right-hand column, paragraph 2 * * page 2552, left-hand column, paragraph 1 * * page 2553, right-hand column *	1-13

The supplementary search report has been based on the last set of claims valid and available at the start of the search.

Place of search The Hague	Date of completion of the search 13 November 2023	Examiner Malamoussi, A
------------------------------	--	---------------------------

CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS

X: particularly relevant if taken alone	P: intermediate document
Y: particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category	T: theory or principle underlying the invention
A: technological background	E: earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date
O: non-written disclosure	D: document cited in the application
&: member of the same patent family, corresponding document	L: document cited for other reasons

Disclaimer: this document has been automatically generated using data structured in accordance with WIPO standard ST.36 from the database of search reports of the European Patent Office. For technical reasons, its content and layout may differ from that of the original publication. Only the original published information is legally binding.



SUPPLEMENTARY PARTIAL EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT

under Rule 62a and/or 63 of the European Patent Convention. This report shall be considered, for the purposes of subsequent proceedings, as the European search report

Application number:
EP 20 83 11 93

INCOMPLETE SEARCH

The Search Division considers that the present application, or one or more of its claims, does/do not comply with the EPC so that only a partial search (R. 62a, 63) has been carried out.

Claim(s) completely searchable: 1-3, 5-13

Claim(s) searched incompletely: 4

Claim(s) not searched:

Reason for the limitation of the search:

[0001] Claim 4 (g) and (h) aim at providing an antigen-binding domain that binds to the same epitope on PDGF-D with any one of the antigen-binding domains of (e) to (f); or (h) an antigen-binding domain that competes for binding to PDGF-D with any one of the antigen-binding domains of (e) to (f).

[0002] Claim 4 (g) tries to define the antibody by an unusual parameter and is therefore not searchable. The antibody is defined as binding to the same epitope as an antigen binding domain according to claim 4(e) to (f). The application fails however to disclose the epitope to which these antibodies, according to claim 4(e) to (f), bind. Assuming that in the prior art antibodies against PDGF-D were disclosed for which the exact epitope is known, it is not possible to determine whether these antibodies fall under the present claims or not. Without the disclosure of the exact epitopes of the antibodies, present claim 4(g) cannot be searched in meaningful manner. In addition the claims do not define by which method and under which conditions the epitopes will have to be determined. It is general knowledge that different methods provide different epitopes. For example a peptide scanning experiment generally results in a different epitope than an epitope determined by X-ray crystallography.

[0003] Therefore the definition by an antibody through undefined epitopes is an unusual parameter which is not searchable. Claim 4 (g) is inherently unclear and the subject-matter of claim 4 (g) is not searched and thus not examined in the present ESOP. See Guidelines: B-VIII-3 "The applicant's choice of parameter to define his invention renders a meaningful comparison with the prior art impossible, perhaps because the prior art has not employed the same parameter, or has employed no parameter at all. In such a case, the parameter chosen by the applicant may lack clarity (see Art. 84 ; F-IV, 4.11). It may be that the lack of clarity of the parameter is such as to render a meaningful search of the claims or of a claim or of a part of a claim impossible, because the choice of parameter renders a sensible comparison of the claimed invention with the prior art impossible. If so, the application of Rule 63 and the issuing of a subsequent incomplete search report (or, in exceptional cases, no search at all) under Rule 63(2) (according to the procedures defined in B-VIII, 3.1 to 3.3) may be appropriate, the search possibly being restricted to the worked examples, as far as they can be understood, or to the way in which the desired parameter is obtained (any response from the applicant to the invitation under Rule 63(1) being taken into account in determining the subject-matter to be searched to the extent indicated in B-VIII, 3.2).

The supplementary search report has been based on the last set of claims valid and available at the start of the search.

Place of search The Hague	Date of completion of the search 13 November 2023	Examiner Malamoussi, A
------------------------------	--	---------------------------

CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS

X: particularly relevant if taken alone	P: intermediate document
Y: particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category	T: theory or principle underlying the invention
A: technological background	E: earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date
O: non-written disclosure	D: document cited in the application
& : member of the same patent family, corresponding document	L: document cited for other reasons

Disclaimer: this document has been automatically generated using data structured in accordance with WIPO standard ST.36 from the database of search reports of the European Patent Office. For technical reasons, its content and layout may differ from that of the original publication. Only the original published information is legally binding.



SUPPLEMENTARY PARTIAL EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT

under Rule 62a and/or 63 of the European Patent Convention. This report shall be considered, for the purposes of subsequent proceedings, as the European search report

Application number:
EP 20 83 11 93

INCOMPLETE SEARCH

[0004] Moreover, feature (h) of claim 4 lacks clarity as the term "competes for binding" is an unusual parameter. The use of this unusual parameter in the present context is considered to lead to a lack of clarity because the claim does not clearly identify the antigen-binding domains encompassed by it, as the parameter cannot be clearly and reliably determined by indications in the description or by objective procedures which are usual in the art. This makes it impossible to compare the claim to the prior art.

[0005] In reply to the invitation to provide informal clarification, the applicant provided passages in the application as well as arguments as to why the claims were searchable.

[0006] The Search Division carefully studied the arguments presented by the applicant. The Search Division is of the opinion that although not explicitly mentioned, claims 4(c) and 4(d) suffer from the same deficiencies like 4(g) and 4(h) for the same reasons as provided herein above. The objections are not linked only to the reference antibody but relate to the features " binds to the same epitope on PDGF-D" or "competes for binding".

[0007] The search division could not find the arguments presented by the applicant persuasive, for the reasons provided in the ESOP, and has therefore, regarding claim 4, restricted the subject matter of present search to the subject matter relating to multispecific antigen-binding molecules according to claim 4(a)-(b), 4(e)-(f).

The supplementary search report has been based on the last set of claims valid and available at the start of the search.

Place of search The Hague	Date of completion of the search 13 November 2023	Examiner Malamoussi, A
------------------------------	--	---------------------------

CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS

X: particularly relevant if taken alone	P: intermediate document
Y: particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category	T: theory or principle underlying the invention
A: technological background	E: earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date
O: non-written disclosure	D: document cited in the application
& : member of the same patent family, corresponding document	L: document cited for other reasons

Disclaimer: this document has been automatically generated using data structured in accordance with WIPO standard ST.36 from the database of search reports of the European Patent Office. For technical reasons, its content and layout may differ from that of the original publication. Only the original published information is legally binding.



ANNEX TO SUPPLEMENTARY PARTIAL EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT

Application number:
EP 20 83 11 93

This annex lists the patent family members relating to the patent documents cited in the above-mentioned European search report. The members are as contained in the European Patent Office EDP file on 13-11-2023
The European Patent Office is in no way liable for these particulars which are merely given for the purpose of information.

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)		Publication date
WO 2005087812	A1	22-09-2005	US	2005282233 A1	22-12-2005
			WO	2005087812 A1	22-09-2005