Bilski Diagnostic Methods Big Sample Sheet-2

S.No.	Publication No.	Date of Rejection	Filing date	Rejection type	101 Rejection	102 Rejection	103 Rejection	112 Rejection
31	US 20080183104	1/30/2009	1/11/2008	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 12-14 and 16-1 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DiGioia, Ill et al. (US 6,002,859, hereinafter DiGioia) as broadly as claimed.	Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiGioia in view of Taylor et al. (US 6,231,526 Bl , hereinafter Taylor).	N/A
32	US 20080171949	3/23/2009	1/18/2007	N/A	N/A	Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alfano (US 5042494)	1. Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppleson et al. (US 5800350) in view of Nordstrom et al. (US71 27282). 2. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppleson et al. modified by Nordstrom as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Baharav et al. (US 697271 4). 3. Claims 10-1 6 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baharav et al (US 6972714) in view of Nordstrom et al. (US 7127282). 4. Claims 17-22, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baharav et al. modified by Nordstrom as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Coppleson et al. (US 5800350). 5. Claims 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baharav modified by Nordstrom and Coppleson as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Jacques (US 4364008). 6. Claims 31 -32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alfano as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Coppleson (US 5800350) and Nordstrom et al. (US 7127282).	N/A
33	US 20080167565	1/8/2009	1/9/2007	102, 103 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-7, 12, 15-21, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by	Claims 8-1 0, 13-1 4, 22-24, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burton (US	1. Claims 15-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to

						Burton (US 200710032733).	200710032733) in view of Flick et al. (US 6993377).	particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
34	US 20080166031	8/21/2008	3/14/2008	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims I , 2 and 23are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim claims I , 3 and 43 of copending Application No. 10/873,660 in view of Moriyama et a/. (U.S. Publication number 2004/0086163A1)	Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moriyama et a/., "Moriyama" (U.S. Publication number 2004/0086163A1)	Claims 6, 11, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriyama as applied to claim 1 above in view of (Nonlinear Dynamics Ltd., TotalLab Applications, image analysis software for ID, electrophoresis gels, blots and colonies, www.nonlinear.com website, published 9/21/2004 from IDS).	N/A
35	US 20080161731	12/10/2008	12/27/2006	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	1. Claims I, 2, I I, 29, 30 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer (US 200310083596 Al) in view of Song (US 2004101 67420 A1) 2. Claims 3, 5, 12, 31, 33 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer (US 200310083596 Al) in view of Song (US 2004101 67420 Al) as applied to claims 1 and 29 above, an in further view of Solomonow et al. (US 5628722) 3. Claims 4, 6, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer (US 200310083596 Al) in view of Song (US 2004101 67420 Al) and Solomonow et al. (US 5628722) as applied to claims 3,5,31 and 33 above, and in further view of Vosch (US 2007100731 32). 4. Claims 7, 8, 13, 35, 36 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer (US 200310083596 Al) in view of Song (US 2004101 67420 Al) as applied to claims 1 and 29, and in further view of Vosch (US 2007100731 32) 5. Claims 9, 10 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer (US 200310083596 A1) in view of Song (US 2004101 67420 A1)	N/A

							as applied to claims 1 and 29, and in further view of Brann (US 6,059,576). 6. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer (US 200310083596 A1) in view of Song (US 2004101 67420 A1) and Vosch (US 2007100731 32) as applied to claim 35 above and in further view of Brann (US 6,059,576).	
36	US 20080161709	12/24/2008	10/13/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-3, 7-1 2, 14 and 16-1 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mault (US 20021-1 73728).	1. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mault (US 2002101 73728) in view of Yasushi et al. (6,485,418). 2. Claims 4-6, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mault (US 2002101 73728) in view of Jones, Jr. et al. (US 5,076,093).	N/A
37	US 20080161708	9/8/2008	8/4/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	1.Claims 1-3, 5-7, 22-27, 30-32 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Taha et al. (US patent 6,564,090). 2. Claims 7, 9, 25, 29, 30, 34, 35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berger (US Patent 5,560,368). 3. Claims 10-1 3 and 16-1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Starobin et al. (US Patent 6,361,503).	1. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taha et al. (US patent 6,564,090) in view of Morganroth (US Pub. 20030097077). 2. Claims 8, 28, 33 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taha et al. (US patent 6,564,090) in view of Millar et al. (Correlation between refractory periods.. .). 3. Claims 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starobin et al. (US Patent 6,361,503) in view of Millar et al. (Correlation between refractory periods.. .). 4. Claims 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starobin et al. (US Patent 6,361,503) in view of Berger (US Patent 5,560,368).	N/A
38	US 20080161701	11/13/2008	12/28/2006	102 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-9 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haller et al. (US 200210052539).	N/A	Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

39	US 20080161698	8/28/2008	1/3/2007	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claim language is drawn to method of "determining", "analyzing", and "locating" and have no tangible, useful, or concrete result, and are hence non-statutory.	Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tearney et al. (U.S. 2003/0028100 Al) hereinafter "Tearney".	Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tearney et al. (U.S. 200310028 100 Al) in view of Nordstrom et al. (U.S. 200210177777 Al).	N/A
40	US 20080161668	2/12/2009	12/29/2006	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Haim (US 20020087089) in view of Rosenberg et al. (US 20060275775). 2. Claims I, 2, and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafir (US 6371 930) in view of Ben-Haim (WO 97124981). 3. Claims 13-1 6, and 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafir (US 6371 930) in view of Rosenberg et al. (US 200610276775). 4. Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafir in view of Ben-Haim and Further in view of Hilton et al. (US 3250012).	N/A
41	US 20080161653	2/5/2009	4/16/2007	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by TW 357077. ?707 discloses in the English translation, and by applicant?s admission in the disclosure, all of the limitations of the instant invention	Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubell.	N/A
42	US 20080154143	2/5/2009	1/11/2007	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12-1 4 and 16-1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Xue et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 200510038352 Al. Xue et al. ?352 anticipates:	1. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xue et al. ?352 as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Arnold et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,713,367. 2. Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xue et al. ?352	N/A

							as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Xue et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,792,065.	
43	US 20080154122	1/10/2008	12/21/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-2 and 7-1 0, 12, 16-1 7, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Slager (USPN 5,771,895).	1. Claims 3, I I, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slager in view of Walczak et al. (Pub. No. 2006101 551 88). 2. Claims 4-5, 13-14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slager in view of Yim et al. (Pub. No. 2002101 36440) and Cohen-Solal (USPN 5,933,518). 3. Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slager in view of Yim and Cohen-Solal as applied to claims 4 and 13 above, and further in view of Kohle (Pub. No. 200410096088).	N/A
44	US 20080154098	5/19/2008	12/20/2006	102 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. US Patent Number 6,569,094 B2.	N/A	Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
45	US 20080146956	2/12/2009	12/17/2006	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1,4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallejo (U.S. Patent 6,171,8 1 1) in view of Ohara et al., Journal of Gastroenterology 2004: 39:621-628. 2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallejo (U.S. Patent 6,171,8 1 1) in view of Ohara et al., Journal of Gastroenterology 2004: 39:621-628, and further in view of Wong et al., Ailment Pharmacol Ther 2003; 17: 253-257. 3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallejo (U.S.Patent 6,17 1,8 1 I), in view of Ohara et al., Journal of Gastroenterology 2004: 39:62 1-628 and further in view of Aygen (U.S. Patent Application Publication 20060 17 1887). 4. Claims	Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1 12, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

							6, 8- 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallejo (U.S. Patent 6,17 1,8 1 1) in view of Meretek?s proposed BREATHTEKTM Urea Breath Test package insert for Helicobacter pylori. 5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallejo (U.S.Patent 6,17 1,8 1 1) in view of Meretek?s proposed BREATHTEKTM Urea Breath Test package insert for Helicobacter pylori, in view of Aygen (U.S. Patent Application Publication 20060 17 1887) 6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vallejo (U.S. Patent 6,17 1,8 1 1) in view of Meretek?s proposed BREATHTEKTM Urea Breath Test package insert for Helicobacter pylori) in view of Ohara et al., Journal of Gastroenterology 2004: 39:621-628, and further in view of Wong et al., Ailment Pharmacol Ther 2003; 17: 253-257,	
46	US 20080146905	3/19/2009	10/4/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-4, 6-1 1, 19, 20, 26, 27, 28, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weinberg (US 5,519,221).	Claims 5, 12-1 8, 21 -25, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg (US 5,519 221) in view of Nelson et al (US 7,291,841 B2).	N/A
47	US 20080146897	3/13/2009	12/7/2005	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	1. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 21-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gayen et a1 (Two-dimensional near-infrared transillumination imaging of biomedical media with a chromium-doped forsterite laser. Applied Optics 37(22) p. 5327-5336. 1998), hereinafter Gayen (1998), of record, in view of Levenson et al (US Patent No. 6,750,964), hereinafter Levenson (?964). 2. Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gayen (1998)	N/A

							and Levenson (?964) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Alfano (US Patent No. , 5,371,368), hereinafter Alfano (?368), of record. 3. Claims 13, 16-19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gayen . (1998) and Levenson (?964) as applied to claims 2 and 15 above, and further in view of Wang et al (Ballistic 2-D Imaging Through Scattering Walls Using an Ultrafast Optical Kerr Gate. Science. 253:p. 769-771. 1991), hereinafter Wang (1991), of record.	
48	US 20080139967	2/4/2009	10/18/2006	102, 103 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1, 5-10, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication 2002101 93670 (Garfield et al.).	1. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14-17, 20, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication 2002101 93670 (Garfield et al.) as modified by United States Patent 6421558 (Huey et al.). 2. Claims 3, 4, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfield et al. as modified by Huey et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14-1 7, 20, 21 and 22 above, and further in view of United States Patent 6663570 (Mott et al.). 3. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfield et al. as modified by Huey et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14-17, 20, 21 and 22 above, and further in view of United States Patent 5301 680 (Rosenberg). 4. Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfield et al. as modified by Huey et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14-1 7, 20, 21 and 22 above, and further in view of United States Patent 4781 200 (Baker). 5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfield et al. as modified by Huey	1. Claim 8 contains the trademarksltrade names Bluetooth, Wi-Fi, Zigbie, and wireless USB. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

							et al. and Mott et al. as applied to claims 3, 4, 19 and 23 above, and further in view of Baker. 6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfield et al. as modified by Huey et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14-17, 20, 21 and 22 above, and further in view of United States Patent 5442940 (Secker et al.). 6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfield et al. as modified by Huey et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14-17, 20, 21 and 22 above, and further in view of United States Patent 5670749 (Hon). 7. Claims 2-4 and l l are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfield et al.	
49	US 20080139953	12/12/2008	11/1/2006	101, 102 and 103 rejections	Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 10 1 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-3 & 15-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abreu (US 2004/0242976)	1. Claims 4-7 & 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abreu (US 200410242976) in view of Owen et al. (US 200310055460). 2. Claims 30-32,39 & 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abreu (US 200410242976) in view of Owen et al. (US 200310055460). 3. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abreu (US 200410242976) in view of Owen et al. (US 200310055460). 4. Claim 19-24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abreu (US 200410242976) in view of Schraag (US 5,309,918). 5. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abreu (US 200410242976) in view of Ortega et al. (US 200610 13600 1). 6. Claims 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abreu (US 200410242976) in view of Westra et al.	N/A

							(US 200610183434). 7. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abreu (US 200410242976) in view of Eshelman et al. (US 200310001742). 8. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abreu (US 200410242976) in view of Cooper et al. (US 5,294,928)	
50	US 20080139951	11/26/2008	12/8/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-5, 7-9, 1 1-1 2, & 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Porat et al. (USP 6,277,078; hereinafter "Porat").	1. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porat et al.(USP 6,277,078). Porat describes trending the cardiac flow turbulence over a time period; however, the detection of complete occlusion of the blood vessel is not specified. 2. Claims 6 & 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porat et al.(USP 6,277,078) in view of Benedict et al.(USP 5,520,190; hereinafter "Benedict"). 3. Claims 13, 14, & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porat et al.(USP 6,277,078) in view of Kadhiresan(USP 5,935,081).	N/A
51	US 20080139899	4/23/2008	11/2/2007	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	Claims 1-9 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacobsen et al. US Patent Number 6,198,394 (hereinafter Jacobsen).	Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobsen et al. US Patent Number 6,198,394 (hereinafter Jacobsen) as applied to claim 1 above.	1. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. 2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. 3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

								applicant regards as the invention. 4. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
52	US 20080139898	10/28/2008	12/7/2006	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 1-1 4, and 29-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sunvit et al. US Patent Number 6,024,699.	N/A	N/A
53	US 20080139891	8/26/2008	10/25/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-6, and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker et al. US Patent Number 6,302,844 Bl.	Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. US Patent Number 6,302,844 Bl as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lang 6,758,812 B2	N/A
54	US 20080132800	1/30/2009	11/30/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	1. Claims 1,3,4,5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Denker et al (6,592,518). 2. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dimmer et al (2004101 38554).	1. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denker et al (6,592,518) in view of Chinchoy (2004101 72079). 2. Claims 6-1 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chinchoy (2004101 72079) in view of Denker et al (6,592,518). 3. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denker et al (6,592,518) in view of Ben-Heim (6,285,898). 4. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denker et al (6,592,518) in view of Ben-Heim (6,285,898), and further in view of Chinchoy (2004101 72079). 5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dimmer et al (2004101 38554) in view of Chinchoy (2004101 72079).	N/A
55	US 20080132799	3/19/2009	11/30/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brunner et a1 (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0004652).	1. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunner et a1 in view of Karjalainen et a1 (Karjalainen, P. A,; Tarvainen, M. R.; Laitinen, T., "Principal	N/A

							Component Regression Approach for QT Variability Estimation, " Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, 2005. IEEE-EMBS 2005. 27th Annual International Conference, vol., no., pp. 1145-1 147, 17-18 Jan. 2006) 2. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunner et a1 in view of Berger (US Patent No. 5,560,368).	
56	US 20080132797	3/6/2009	10/31/2007	103 rejection	N/A	Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticiapated by U. S. Publication No. 200210172323 to Karellas et al.	N/A	N/A
57	US 20080132782	8/20/2008	1/27/2005	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	Claims 1 - 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Uzgris et al. (US 6470,204 Bl) in view of Greenleaf et al. (US 2001/0053384 Al).	N/A
58	US 20080132777	3/3/2009	2/1/2005	101, 103 and 112 rejections	Claims 21 - 40 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 - 17 of copending Application No. 11/044,239.	N/A	1. Claims 21 - 40 and 45 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Helfer (US 6,925,322 B2) in view of Uzgiris et al. (US 6,4 70,204 Bl). 2. Claims 41 - 44 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Helfer (US 6,925,322 B2) in view of Uzgiris et al. (US 6,470,204 Bl), in view of Tsujita (US 5,8 79,284).	Claims 1, 34, 36, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112,firstparagraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.
59	US 20080119724	3/18/2009	11/17/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	1. Claims 1, 10-1 1 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DiGioia III et al. (US Patent No. 5,880,976). 2. Claims 1-4, 7-1 4 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mire et al. (US Pub No. 2004101 71 924). 3. Claim 1, 6-7, 9-1 1, 15-1 6, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sahay et al. (US Patent No. 5,824,085).	Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mire et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bisek et al. (US Patent No. 5,306,306)	N/A
60	US 20080119709	10/8/2008	10/31/2006	101, 102 and 103	Claims 1-1 8 are provisionally	1. Claims I, 4, 6, 7, and 10 are	Claims 11 -1 5 and 18 are rejected	N/A

				rejections	rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 1115551 56.	rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zocchi (US Patent Application Publication 200610040333). 2. Claims 1 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rasdal (US Patent Application Publication 2005101 54271).	under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Causey (US Patent Application Publication 200410073095) in view of Zocchi.	
61	US 20080119708	3/17/2009	10/25/2006	103 and 112 rejections	N/A	N/A	Claims 21 -30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 200310050546 to Desai et al in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2003101 3061 6 to Steil et al. Regarding claim 21, Desai discloses a method comprising monitoring a data stream associated with an analyte level, wherein a current signal is generated associated with the data stream.	Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
62	US 20080119705	10/2/2008	10/31/2007	101, 102, 103 and 112 rejections	Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.	1. Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by "eDiab: A system for Monitoring, Assisting and Educating People with Diabetes", ICCHP, 2006 to Luque et al (Hereinafter "Luque"). 2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by 2002101 93679 to Malave et al (Hereinafter "Malave").	1. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luque in view of US 2002101 93679 to Malave et al (Hereinafter "Malave"). 2. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luque in view of US 200610025663 to Talbot et al (Hereinafter "Talbot").	Claims I I, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
63	US 20080119702	3/23/2009	10/31/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saidara (US 200510038332).	1. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saidara in view of Peterka (US 200610004603). 2. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saidara in view of Morrison (US 200610293577).	N/A
64	US 20080114269	6/24/2008	10/10/2007	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-6 and 9-1 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (US 6,331,893 Bl , hereinafter	Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (US 6,331,893 Bl , hereinafter Brown).	N/A

						Brown).		
65	US 20080114214	11/13/2008	10/20/2006	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by a tangible result.	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barrera US Patent Publication No. 200510145257 which incorporates by reference in paragraph 0019 of the specification, Malackowski et al. US Patent Publication No. 200110034530 (hereinafter Malackowski).	N/A	N/A
66	US 20080114212	11/13/2008	10/10/2006	101 and 102 rejections	Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by a tangible result.	Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barrera US Patent Publication No. 200510145257 which incorporates by reference in paragraph 0019 of the specification, Malackowski et al. US Patent Publication No. 200110034530 (hereinafter Malackowski).	N/A	N/A
67	US 20080108913	11/7/2008	11/6/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-8, 10-1 8 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Billing (applicant submitted Foreign Reference WO 200510371 03).	Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Billing as applied in claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Guan (US 200510046 1 39).	N/A
68	US 20080108910	12/29/2008	10/7/2007	102 rejection	N/A	Claims 22-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Deck et al (US 200810082023).	N/A	N/A
69	US 20080108906	12/24/2008	11/8/2006	102, 103 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-6, 1 1-1 3, and 18-1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Albrecht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,755,671).	Claims 7-1 0 and 14-1 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albrecht et al.	Claims 1-1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 11 2, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
70	US 20080108884	3/3/2009	9/24/2007	102, 103 and 112 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-5, 11, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith (US Patent Number 6,980,419 B2).	N/A	Claims 1-5, 1 1, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1 12, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

								applicant regards as the invention.
71	US 20080108883	1/8/2009	11/2/2007	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	1. Claims 1-6, and 9-1 0 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kiselik (US 7066896). 2. Claims 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shenoy et al. (US 660901 7).	1. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiselik (US 7066896) in view of Einav et al. (US 2006029361 7). 2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiselik modified by Einav as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Brown (US 6692449). 3. Claims 14-17, 19-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott (US 61 55993) in view of Brown (US 6692449). 4. Claims 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shenoy and Brown as applied to claims 14 and 15 above, and further in view of Scott (US 61 55993).	N/A
72	US 20080103416	2/4/2009	12/17/2007	103 rejection	N/A	N/A	Claims 1-4, 7-1 1, 14-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 5,916,179 to Sharrock ("Sharrock") in view of US Pat. No. 4,739,211 to Strachan ("Strachan").	N/A
73	US 20080103402	3/18/2009	10/30/2006	102 and 103 rejections	N/A	Claims 1-4, 7-1 6, 18-23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan (US 461 0254).	1. Claims 5, 6, 17, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (US 461 0254). 2. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (US 461 0254) in view of Tamura (US 200310080712).	N/A
74	US 20070244373	4/30/2008	5/2/2006	101, 102 and 103 rejections	1. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 2. Claims 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and to	1. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication No. 200310014742 to Lewkowicz et al. 2. Claims 1-6, 8-1 0, 12, 16, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication No.	1. Claims I, 10, I I, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,442,413 to Silver in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 200310014742 to Lewkowicz et al. 2. Claims 7, 13, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jin, as applied to claims 1-6, 8-1 0, 12, 16, 17, 19, and	N/A

					overcome the 101 rejection	200410050394 to Jin.	20 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,477,406 to Turcott. 3. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewkowicz, as applied to Claims I, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 19 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,689,056 to Kilcoyne et al.	