

Datum  
Date cf Form 1507  
Date

Blatt  
Sheet 1  
Feuille

Anmelde-Nr:  
Application No: 10 012 635.8  
Demande n°:

The examination is being carried out on the **following application documents**

**Description, Pages**

1-27 as originally filed

**Claims, Numbers**

1-10 as originally filed

**Drawings, Sheets**

1/3-3/3 as originally filed

1 Introductory Remarks

1.1 With letter dated 12.04.2011 the Applicant was informed that third-party observations pursuant to Article 115 EPC were received for European patent application 10012635.8. The cited documents which call into question the patentability of presently claimed subject-matter are also listed in the search report. Selected documents are further discussed below.

1.2 Present application appears to fulfil the requirements of Article 76 EPC.

2 Reference is made to the following documents; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

D1 WO 99/42094 A (HENG MADALENE C Y [US]) 26 August 1999 (1999-08-26)

D2 DENG W NIE R LIU J: "Comparison of pharmacological effect of four andrographolides", CAPLUS, 1982, XP002958755,

D3 CN 1 125 124 A (GUANGXI ZHONGSHOU PHARMACEUTIC [CN]) 26 June 1996 (1996-06-26)

D4 OHKURA T ET AL: "A GC/ MS SPECTROMETRIC STUDY ON CONSTITUENTS ISOLATED FROM CURCUMA WENYUJIN", JAPANESE JOURNAL OF PHARMACOGNOSY (SHOYAKUGAKU ZASSHI), JAPANESE SOCIETY OF PHARMACOGNOSY, XX,

vol. 44, no. 3, 1 September 1990 (1990-09-01), pages 171-175,  
XP008003377,  
ISSN: 0037-4377

- D5 "HaridrĀ dilepah 01",  
TKDL,, 1 August 1999 (1999-08-01), XP003024376,
- D6 PARMAR V S ET AL: "OCCURRENCE OF PONGAMOL AS THE ENOL  
STRUCTURE IN TEPHROSIA-PURPUREA",  
PHYTOCHEMISTRY (OXFORD),  
vol. 28, no. 2, 1989, pages 591-594, XP002633565,  
ISSN: 0031-9422
- D7 "MĀ 1/4 rvĀ dyaghrtam",  
TKDL,, 1 January 2001 (2001-01-01), XP003024377,
- D8 "Tiktakaghrtam",  
TKDL,, 1 January 1922 (1922-01-01), XP003024378,
- D9 "MĀ 1/4 rvĀ dyaghrtam",  
TKDL,, 1 January 1990 (1990-01-01), XP003024379,
- D10 WO 97/02831 A1 (CATHAY HERBAL LAB PTY LTD [AU]; YANG YI FAN  
[AU]) 30 January 1997 (1997-01-30)
- D11 WO 00/00186 A1 (AMERICAN MEDICAL RESEARCH INC [US]; COURY  
WILLIAM S [US]; BETTLE GRISC) 6 January 2000 (2000-01-06)
- D12 US 6 210 701 B1 (DARLAND GARY K [US] ET AL) 3 April 2001  
(2001-04-03)

3 Article 53(c) EPC

The subject-matter of present claims 8-10 claims methods for treatment of the human or animal body by therapy. According to Article 53(c) EPC methods for treatment of the human or animal body by therapy are not patentable.

The Applicant is requested to redraft the claim as a so-called "first or second medical use" claim (Guidelines C-IV, 4.8).

4 Articles 83 and 84 EPC

- 4.1 Claims 1-10 do not meet the requirements of Article 84 EPC in that the matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined. Independent claims 1 and 8 attempt to define the subject-matter in terms of the result to be achieved, i.e. the synergistic effect on specific inhibition of inducible COX-2 activity and minimal effect on COX-1 activity.

Due to the wording of the claims, it is not clear whether claims 1-7 might represent product claims or as so-called "first or second medical use" claims.

For present examination, claims 1-7 have been interpreted as product claims.

- 4.2 By the wording "a curcuminoid species", "a diterpene lactone species" and "a triterpene species" in claims 1, 5-6 and 8-10 the compounds or compositions to be combined are not clearly defined. For instance, the term "a curcuminoid species" is not restricted to specific, well defined compounds and could further also be directed to a whole plant or extracts thereof containing curcumin or related compounds.

In addition, in the absence of a precise definition of the compounds it is also not clear which compounds would fall under the scope of present claim 6 which is directed to certain derivatives of the "curcuminoid species", "diterpene lactone species" and "triterpene species".

The Applicant is requested to precisely define in the claims the compounds to be combined.

- 4.3 In addition, the wording "derivatives thereof" in claims 1 and 8 introduces an additional lack of clarity to the scope of present set of claims.

Said term should be deleted.

- 4.4 Moreover, by claiming a ratio of the components of 1:10 to 10:1 the scope of present set of claims is not well defined (Article 84 EPC). The ratio could refer to the proportion of two specific compounds, e.g. the ratio of curcumin and oleanolic acid. The ratio could alternatively refer to the sum of all "curcuminoid species", e.g. curcumin and bisdemethoxycurcumin, compared to the sum of all "a diterpene lactone species" and/ or "a triterpene species", e.g. andrographolide, andrographan, ursolic acid and oleanolic acid. Furthermore, the ratio may refer to the amount of e.g. curcuma longa and andrographis as such.

With regard to the claimed ratio of 1:10 to 10:1 the following is also to be considered. It would represent an undue burden for the person skilled in the art to analyse a multitude of ingredients of a complex composition, e.g. a

traditional Chinese medicine, in order to determine if based on the analytical data the ratio of the total amounts of the respective components would be in the claimed range (Article 83 EPC).

- 4.5 Likewise the dosages of present claim 8, i.e. 0.001 to 30.0 mg for the "curcuminoid species" and 0.5 to 20.0 mg for the terpene species, may refer to either specific compounds alone, to the sum of various compounds of the respective groups or even to the plant or an extract thereof.
- 4.6 Furthermore, by the wording "an effective amount of..." which is used repeatedly in claims 1 and 8 it is not clear which amount would actually fall under the claimed scope of present claims 1-8 and 10. It appears that the amount would in fact depend on the disease to be treated and also on the further ingredients which may be present in the claimed mixture. At least it is clear that the term is not directed to an amount of a component effective if administered as a sole agent.
- 4.7 Present claims 8-10 do not comply with the requirements of Article 84 EPC as by their wording said claims are not directed to the treatment of symptoms of inflammation, arthritis, acne, rosacea or psoriasis, but only to the administration to a patient suffering from these diseases. Thus present claims 8-10 could be understood to be directed to the treatment of any disease in a patient belonging the defined patient group.
- 4.8 With regard to the diseases listed in present claim 8 it is also to be noted that "inflammation" is not considered to represent a well defined disease. Rather than referring to a specific disease the term relates to pharmacological mechanisms underlying certain diseases such as arthritis.
- 4.9 The term "pharmaceutical grade" in present claim 2 does not have a well defined meaning. Any composition administered to a human would have the required purity.

The Applicant may amend the wording according to the definition given in the description (present application, page 8, lines 13-22).

- 4.10 The subject-matter of present dependent claim 10 is defined by a result to be achieved, i.e. a certain dosage regimen defined by a desired serum concentration. Such a definition of a claim renders the scope of the claim unclear (Article 84 EPC). Furthermore, it would represent an undue burden for the person skilled in the art to perform clinical studies in order to identify a dosage regimen which would result in the desired effect (Article 83 EPC).

Consequently, the wording of present claim 10 may only be acceptable for a claim which depends on a novel and inventive independent claim.

5 Article 54 EPC

The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 52(1) EPC because the subject-matter of claims 1-10 is not new within the meaning of Article 54(1) and (2) EPC.

- 5.1 A composition can only be validly claimed as an invention once and cannot be validly claimed subsequently again under the guise of a specified pharmacological mechanism, for instance selective inhibition of COX-2. This also applies to the use of a composition for the preparation of a medicament for the treatment of a specified disease which cannot be validly claimed subsequently again for the treatment of the same disease under the guise of said newly specified mechanism. In fact, the discovery of such a new way of action is not an invention, as the technical effect obtained remains the same (preventing or curing the same disease or alleviating its symptoms). The technical effect being identical, the use is not changed by the discovery of the mechanism. Only if such a discovery would lead to a better technical effect, which may be put into a practical effect (e.g. another galenic composition which delivers the medicament more selectively at the required site or receptor), or to a new technical effect (e.g. the possibility to treat diseases hitherto not known to be cured by that medicament), a potential invention is made. The specification of a mechanism consequently does not limit or change the character of neither a composition claim nor a therapeutic use claim.
- 5.2 In view of the objections made above under Article 84 EPC (item 4), the Applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that an unclear feature cannot confer novelty to a claim.
- 5.3 An attempt is apparently made to define the components of claim 5 by their potential origin or by a process of their isolation from a plant. This amounts to a product-by-process claim. However, such a claim is only novel if the product itself is novel.
- 5.4 In view of item 4.6, it appears that the criteria of "an effective amount" for the respective components would be met for any composition which has a therapeutic effect.

- 5.5 According to present application triterpenes such as ursolic acid and oleanolic acid are to be found in a wide variety of botanicals (present application, page 9, lines 7-8). The list of exemplified plants covers almost 2 pages (present application, page 9, line 8 - page 10, line 24). In addition, it appears that triterpenes may be found in any plant.

As disclosed for instance in D4 curcuma is known to contain inter alia the triterpene beta-sitosterol (D4, page 171, paragraph 1). Furthermore, the use of curcuma without isolation of specific compounds implies also the use of conjugates according present claim 4, as well as additional agents according to present claim 7. Consequently, any document disclosing the use of curcuma is to be regarded as novelty destroying for at least present claims 1-2 and 4-7.

- 5.6 Present claims appear to be novel over D1 which discloses the treatment of skin diseases such as psoriasis, as well as inflammation in general with curcumin (D1, examples 7-8, tables 8-9, claims 1-24).

- 5.7 Present claims appear to be novel over D2 which discloses the anti-inflammatory properties of andrographolide and closely related compounds (D2, whole document).

- 5.8 D3 discloses a pharmaceutical composition comprising andrographis and curcuma (D3, abstract). The anticholera composition comprises preferably 7-17 parts andrographis and 1-11 parts curcuma tuber, most preferably 12 and 6 (D3, claims 1-2). As also stated by the Applicant andrographolide is a natural product isolated from andrographis and the curcuminoids such as curcumin are isolated from curcuma (present application, page 2, line 29 - page 3, line 2, page 8, lines 13-22 and page 9, lines 3-8). The ratio between both components thus overlaps with presently claimed ratio of 1:10 to 10:1.

Therefore and in view of items 5.1-5.5, the subject-matter of present claims 1-7 is not novel over D3.

- 5.9 D5 discloses a therapeutic combination for use in the treatment of psoriasis which comprises inter alia curcuma longa and tephrosia purpurea which are present in a ratio of 1:1. (D5, abstract). Tephrosia purpurea contains inter alia beta-sitosterol and ursolic acid as disclosed for instance in D6 (D6, abstract and page 591, left-hand column, paragraph 2).

Therefore and in view of items 5.1-5.5, the subject-matter of present claims 1-2 and 4-10 is not novel over D5.



5.10 D7 discloses a pharmaceutical composition comprising inter alia 12 g of curcuma longa and 12 g of andrographis paniculata. Said composition is for use in the treatment of inter alia inflammation (D7, abstract). In view of the multitude of further natural products it appears to be implicit that the composition further comprises at least traces of triterpenes according to present claim 4.

Therefore and in view of items 5.1-5.5, the subject-matter of present claims 1-10 is not novel over D7.

5.11 For the same reasons as D7, the subject-matter of present claims 1-10 lacks novelty over each of the documents D8 and D9 (D8, abstract; D9, abstract). D9 discloses a minor variation of the composition of D7.

5.12 D10 discloses a herbal composition comprising 5 mg of curcuma longa tuber and 5 mg of glycyrrhiza uralensis root (D10, table 1). The composition is for the treatment of hepatic disorders including autoimmune liver disease (D10, page 2, lines 10-11). Autoimmune liver disease may be regarded as an inflammatory disease.

Therefore and in view of items 5.1-5.5, the subject-matter of present claims 1-2 and 4-10 is not novel over D10.

5.13 D11 discloses an anti-inflammatory composition comprising 0.1% and 0.05% of copper-curcumin and 0.05% of glycyrrhizic acid (D11, examples 13-14). The compositions are for the treatment of skin disorders such as burns, acne, psoriasis (D11, page 7, paragraphs 4-5).

Therefore and in view of items 5.1-5.5, the subject-matter of present claims 1-2 and 4-10 is not novel over D11.

5.14 D12 discloses a composition comprising inter alia curcumin (daily dose of 400 mg), rosemary (daily dose of 200 mg) and the antioxidant vitamin C (D12, table 3). D1 further discloses that rosemary comprises inter alia ursolic acid (D12, column 6, lines 42-49). According to present description rosemary comprises ursolic acid and oleanolic acid (present application, page 10, lines 9-24). In addition, rosemary is generally known to further comprise antioxidants and betulinic acid. The preferred composition has demonstrated clinical effects in patients suffering from rheumatoid arthritis, psoriasis, colitis and inflammatory bowel disease (D12, column 10, lines 8-18, table 7).

Therefore and in view of items 5.1-5.5, the subject-matter of present claims 1-2 and 4-10 is not novel over D12.

6 Article 56 EPC

The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 52(1) EPC because the subject-matter of present set of claims, as far as novel, does not involve an inventive step within the meaning of Article 56 EPC.

6.1 Present application shows a synergistic effect for specific combinations of a 1:4 formulation of curcumin and andrographolide (present application, example 1, tables 3-5), of a 1:2 formulation of curcumin and ursolic acid (present application, example 2, tables 6-8) and of a 1:2 formulation of curcumin and oleanolic acid (present application, example 3, tables 9-11).

6.2 However, present application does not credibly show that each of the numerous combinations claimed would have the effect shown for 3 specific combinations only. For instance, the application merely alleges that any "curcuminoid species" would have the same effect as shown for curcumin itself.

The Applicant is kindly request to either provide arguments or pharmacological data as support for the generalisation from curcumin/andrographolide to any combination of "a curcuminoid species"/"a diterpene lactone species", as well as from curcumin/ursolic acid and curcumin/oleanolic acid to any combination of "a curcuminoid species"/"a triterpene species".

6.3 As far as directed to combinations for which no unexpected effect has been shown the following applies:

Each of the compounds presently claimed in combination as a treatment of the claimed diseases is separately known to possess a therapeutic activity against that same disease or condition (see e.g. D1 and D2, items 5.6 and 5.7). Therefore, unless combining these compounds gives rise to an unexpected technical effect, such as synergy, or overcomes a technical prejudice, no inventive effort is needed to arrive at the solution of providing this combination as a solution to the problem of finding a treatment for diseases such as psoriasis (see Guidelines C-IV, 11.5 and (Annex) 2.2 and 4).

6.4 The Applicant extrapolates from the specific 1:4 and 1:2 ratios of the 3 tested combinations to the significantly broader range of 1:10 to 10:1 without even providing pharmacological data for different ratios as support for the 3 specific combinations. Consequently, the claimed range appears to be merely arbitrary.



6.5 It is to be noted that the observed synergistic effects are to be considered as the discovery of mechanisms underlying the treatment of certain diseases with combinations as claimed (see also item 5.1). Such a discovery can only be taken into account for inventive step of a claim which is novel and only as far as directly relevant for the claimed subject-matter.

It is observed that the application merely describes theoretically how the efficacy of the claimed combinations in the treatment of the claimed diseases could be assessed (present application, examples 4-10).

7 The Applicant is invited to file a new set of claims taking further into account the following remarks:

7.1 For compliance with Article 123(2) EPC the Applicant should not amend the claims by simply deleting terms objected to under Article 84 EPC (see e.g. items 4.1, 4.4 and 4.6).

He is requested to establish novelty and inventive step by introducing technical features which unambiguously allow to distinguish the claimed subject-matter from that of the prior art. Consequently, a vague definition such as "effective amount" would not represent the distinguishing feature.

7.2 In view of the wording "composition comprising ..." applied throughout the application, it is not yet apparent how the Applicant may establish unambiguously novelty over medicinal preparations containing curcuma longa, andrographis and further plants or extracts thereof. Present application does not appear to provide a basis for a claim directed to a "composition consisting of ...".

7.3 When filing amended claims the Applicant should at the same time bring the description into conformity with the amended claims. Care should be taken during revision, especially of the introductory portion and any statements of problem or advantage, not to add subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as originally filed (Article 123(2) EPC).

7.4 In order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application with the requirements of Article 123(2) EPC, the Applicant should clearly identify the amendments carried out, irrespective of whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate the passages of the application as filed on which these amendments are based (see Guidelines E-II, 1).

If the Applicant regards it as appropriate these indications could be submitted in handwritten form on a copy of the relevant parts of the application as filed.

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT			
Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)
X	CN 1 125 124 A (GUANGXI ZHONGSHOU PHARMACEUTIC [CN]) 26 June 1996 (1996-06-26) * abstract * * claims 1-2 *	1-7	INV. A61K31/047 A61K31/075 A61K31/12 A61K31/19 A61K31/365
X	----- DATABASE TKDL [Online]  1 August 1999 (1999-08-01), "HaridrÄ dilepah 01", XP003024376, Database accession no. HG/1393 * abstract * & KÄLI DÄSA: "VaidyamanoramÄ", 2005 page 54, * the whole document *	1,2,4-10	A61K31/56 A61K31/704 A61K36/00 A61K45/06 A61P29/00  1
X	----- DATABASE TKDL [Online]  1 January 2001 (2001-01-01), "MÄ 1/4 rvÄ dyaghrtam", XP003024377, Database accession no. AK/1099 * abstract * & ÇAKRAPÄNIDATTAH: "Çakradattah", 2002 page 83, * the whole document *	1-10	TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (IPC)  A61K
X	----- DATABASE TKDL [Online]  1 January 1922 (1922-01-01), "Tiktakaghrtam", XP003024378, Database accession no. AK/2960 * abstract *	1-10	
-/--			
2 The present search report has been drawn up for all claims			
Place of search The Hague		Date of completion of the search 20 April 2011	Examiner Herdemann, Matthias
<p>CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS</p> <p>X : particularly relevant if taken alone Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category A : technological background O : non-written disclosure P : intermediate document</p> <p>T : theory or principle underlying the invention E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date D : document cited in the application L : document cited for other reasons ----- &amp; : member of the same patent family, corresponding document</p>			

EPO FORM 1503 03.02 (P.4/03.1)

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT			
Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)
X	& MÄDHAVA: "Vrndaadhava", 1922 page 504, * the whole document * ----- DATABASE TKDL [Online] 1 January 1990 (1990-01-01), "MÄ 1/4 rvÄ dyaghrta", XP003024379, Database accession no. VS/3826 * abstract * & GOVT OF INDIA: "Sahastrayoga", 1990 page 330, * the whole document * -----	1-10	
X	WO 97/02831 A1 (CATHAY HERBAL LAB PTY LTD [AU]; YANG YI FAN [AU]) 30 January 1997 (1997-01-30) * page 2, lines 10-11 * * table 1 * -----	1,2,4-10	TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (IPC)
X	WO 00/00186 A1 (AMERICAN MEDICAL RESEARCH INC [US]; COURY WILLIAM S [US]; BETTLE GRISC) 6 January 2000 (2000-01-06) * page 7, paragraph 4-5 * * examples 13-14 * -----	1,2,4-10	
X	US 6 210 701 B1 (DARLAND GARY K [US] ET AL) 3 April 2001 (2001-04-03) * column 6, lines 42-49 * * table 3 * * column 10, lines 8-18; table 7 * ----- -/--	1,2,4-10	
The present search report has been drawn up for all claims			
Place of search		Date of completion of the search	Examiner
The Hague		20 April 2011	Herdemann, Matthias
CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS X : particularly relevant if taken alone Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category A : technological background O : non-written disclosure P : intermediate document T : theory or principle underlying the invention E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date D : document cited in the application L : document cited for other reasons & : member of the same patent family, corresponding document			

EPO FORM 1505 03 82 (PC/CO1)

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT				
Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)	
X	<p><b>DATABASE TKDL [Online]</b></p> <p>1 January 1926 (1926-01-01), "Takmeed Bara-e-taskeen", XP003024374, Database accession no. JA6/1040E * abstract * &amp; MOHAMMAD NAJMUL GHANI KHAN: "Khazaain-al-Advia", 1926 page 1050, * the whole document *</p> <p>-----</p>	1,2,4-10		
X	<p><b>DATABASE TKDL [Online]</b></p> <p>1 January 1921 (1921-01-01), "Habb-e-Taaoghon", XP003024380, Database accession no. MH1/3756 * abstract * &amp; MOHAMMAD SHAREEF KHAN: "ILaaj-al-Amraaz", 1921 page 328, * the whole document *</p> <p>-----</p>	1,2,4-10		TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (IPC)
X	<p><b>DATABASE TKDL [Online]</b></p> <p>1 January 1909 (1909-01-01), "Raughane-e-Surkh", XP003024382, Database accession no. AH5/504 * abstract * &amp; MOHAMMAD AKMAL KHAN: "Qaraabaadeen Azam wa Akmal", 1909 pages 399-400, * the whole document *</p> <p>-----</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-/--</p>	1,2,4-10		
The present search report has been drawn up for all claims				
Place of search		Date of completion of the search	Examiner	
The Hague		20 April 2011	Herdemann, Matthias	
CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS		<p>T : theory or principle underlying the invention E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date D : document cited in the application L : document cited for other reasons &amp; : member of the same patent family, corresponding document</p>		
<p>X : particularly relevant if taken alone Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category A : technological background O : non-written disclosure P : intermediate document</p>				

2  
SPO FCPM 1503 03.82 (P04C001)

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT			
Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)
Y	WO 99/42094 A1 (HENG MADALENE C Y [US]) 26 August 1999 (1999-08-26) * examples 7-8; tables 8-9 * * claims 1-24 *	1-10	
Y	----- DATABASE CAPLUS [Online] CHEMICAL ABSTRACTS SERVICE, COLUMBUS, OHIO, US; 1982, DENG W NIE R LIU J: "Comparison of pharmacological effect of four andrographolides", XP002958755, Database accession no. 1982:555926 * abstract *	1-3,5-10	
Y	----- DATABASE TKDL [Online]  1 January 1887 (1887-01-01), "Zimaad-e-Seb", XP003024375, Database accession no. JA7/150Z * abstract * & MOHAMMAD AZAM KHAN: "Muheet-e-Azam", 1887 page 86, * the whole document *	1,2,4-10	TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (IPC)
Y	----- DATABASE TKDL [Online]  1 January 1922 (1922-01-01), "BhÅ 1/4 nimbÅ dicÅ 1/4 rnam (tridosajasothe)", XP003024381, Database accession no. AK/2467B * abstract *	1-3,5-10	
-/--			
The present search report has been drawn up for all claims			
Place of search The Hague		Date of completion of the search 20 April 2011	Examiner Herdemann, Matthias
CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS X : particularly relevant if taken alone Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category A : technological background O : non-written disclosure P : intermediate document T : theory or principle underlying the invention E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date D : document cited in the application L : document cited for other reasons & : member of the same patent family, corresponding document			

EPO FORM 1503 03/02 (P2/C01)

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT			
Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)
	& MADHAVAH: "Vrndarnādhava", 1922 page 418, * the whole document *		
Y	EP 0 776 666 A2 (NIPPON MEKTRON KK [JP]) 4 June 1997 (1997-06-04) * claims 1-5 *	1,2,4-10	
Y	GB 843 137 A (BIOREX LABORATORIES LTD) 4 August 1960 (1960-08-04) * page 1, lines 21-64 * * page 2, lines 54-119 * * examples 1-2 *	1,2,4-10	
X,P	US 6 264 995 B1 (NEWMARK THOMAS [US] ET AL) 24 July 2001 (2001-07-24) * claims; table *	1-10	
E	WO 02/096447 A2 (WEBER & WEBER GMBH & CO KG [DE]; RITTINGHAUSEN REINER [DE]; KOCH VOLKM) 5 December 2002 (2002-12-05) * claims 1, 8, 18 *	1,2,4-10	TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (IPC)
A	OHKURA T ET AL: "A GC/MS SPECTROMETRIC STUDY ON CONSTITUENTS ISOLATED FROM CURCUMA WENYUJIN", JAPANESE JOURNAL OF PHARMACOGNOSY (SHOYAKUGAKU ZASSHI), JAPANESE SOCIETY OF PHARMACOGNOSY, vol. 44, no. 3, 1 September 1990 (1990-09-01), pages 171-175, XP008003377, ISSN: 0037-4377 * page 171, paragraph 1 *	1-10	
-/--			
The present search report has been drawn up for all claims			
Place of search The Hague		Date of completion of the search 20 April 2011	Examiner Herdemann, Matthias
CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS X : particularly relevant if taken alone Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category A : technological background O : non-written disclosure P : intermediate document		T : theory or principle underlying the invention E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date D : document cited in the application L : document cited for other reasons * : member of the same patent family, corresponding document	

EPO FORM 1503 03 02 (FC4C01)



DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT			
Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)
A	PARMAR V S ET AL: "OCCURRENCE OF PONGAMOL AS THE ENOL STRUCTURE IN TEPHROSIA-PURPUREA", PHYTOCHEMISTRY, vol. 28, no. 2, 1989, pages 591-593, XP002633565, (OXFORD) ISSN: 0031-9422 * abstract * * page 591, left-hand column, paragraph 2 * -----	1,2,4-10	
			TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (IPC)
The present search report has been drawn up for all claims			
Place of search		Date of completion of the search	Examiner
The Hague		20 April 2011	Herdemann, Matthias
CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS X : particularly relevant if taken alone Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category A : technological background O : non-written disclosure P : intermediate document T : theory or principle underlying the invention E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date D : document cited in the application L : document cited for other reasons & : member of the same patent family, corresponding document			

2  
 EPC FORM 1508 03.02 (P04C01)