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"The only thing that keeps us alive is brilliance. The only way to protect our brilliance is patents."
-- Edwin Land, founder of Polaroid

"Ideas are to the Information Age what iron ore and other raw materials were to the Industrial Age - only you can’t put a fence around ideas. The closest thing is a patent."
-- Thomas Field Jr.
The Patent Tree
Uniting Technology and Legal Principles to Produce Societal Benefits

Financial Markets Consider Patents

Eli Lilly loses approximately 1/3 of its market capitalization when a court rules against the extension of the Prozac patent.

Prozac sales used to make up approximately 1/3 of all Lilly sales.
Pharma’s Broken Business Model

- Big pharma’s business model, which relies on a few blockbusters to generate profits, is clearly broken. Patent expiration on numerous blockbusters in recent years is already altering the drug landscape.

- Drug companies are also facing many other challenges that necessitate development and implementation of novel R&D strategies.

What is a Patent?

"If a man can...make a better mousetrap, though he builds his house in the woods, the world will make a beaten path to his door."

- Ralph Waldo Emerson in an 1851 lecture

- A US patent is a legal document granted by the federal government whereby the recipient (or "patentee") is conferred the temporary right (limited monopoly) to exclude others from:
  - making,
  - using,
  - selling,
  - offering for sale, or
  - importing into the US the invention for up to 20 years from the filing date.

- A US patent provides protection only in the US and its territories.
- Does not grant the owner/inventor the right to use his invention
- Monopoly is in return for full disclosure to the public
- Patent can be licensed, assigned or conveyed
- Basis of US patent system in the constitution - Thomas Jefferson
The rationale behind patent law is simple.

- An inventor is encouraged to apply for a patent by a promise from the US government of a limited legal monopoly for the invention.
- This promise of limited monopoly rights justifies the development costs and assures a reasonable return on profit.
- In exchange, the inventor publicly discloses the new technology that might have otherwise remained secret and allows the public to freely use, make, sell or import the invention once the patent expires. Hence, the new technology that is brought to light encourages further innovation.
- In this way, society obtains a quid pro quo from inventors in exchange for the temporary grant of exclusive rights.
- Such an advantageous exchange spurs American industry and stimulates commerce.

INVENTORSHIP

Note that unlike the flash-of-genius moment in this BC comic strip, inventions often result from a long progression of experiments and results from the contributions of numerous co-inventors.

A country without a patent office and good patent laws is just a cask and can't travel any way but sideways and backwards.

— Mark Twain, 1889
Einstein in the Bern patent office. “A practical profession is a salvation for a man of my type; an academic career compels a young man to scientific production, and only strong characters can resist the temptation of superficial analysis.”

Image © The Albert Einstein Archives, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel.
Your invention might be brilliant, but odds are somebody else thought of it (and is patenting it) too

"WHAT HAVE YOU BROUGHT?"
“[U]nder section 101 a person may have invented a machine or manufacture, which may include anything under the sun that is made by man.”

Nanomedicines

Figure 1: Nanopharmaceuticals for Drug Delivery
Obviousness – What Do You Think?

Your “Invention”
As an patent owner, you ultimately have four choices regarding your rights:

• You may choose to **do nothing** at all, which will have no effect on your rights (except that the IP owner must still "maintain" his/her patent).
• You may choose to **commercialize** or market the intellectual property to the public – for example, manufacturing a product based on the patent.
• You may **sell** the intellectual property to somebody else (or transfer it for free). Legally, this is known as an assignment.
• You may permit someone else to use your intellectual property for a limited time in exchange for payment (**license**).

Your invention might be brilliant, but odds are somebody else thought of it (and is patenting it) too.
The fact is, that one new idea leads to another, and that to a third, and so on through a course of time until someone, with whom no one of these ideas was original, combines all together, and produces what is justly called a new invention.

— Thomas Jefferson, 1st U.S. Patent Board, circa 1813
The Specification and the Claims

- The specification includes a written description of the invention and the manner and process of making and using it. It must be clear, concise, and enable anyone skilled in the art to reproduce and use the invention.
- The specification must include one or more claims, each of which precisely points out the invention. Claims define the metes and bounds of the property to be protected.
- The claims are the name of the game. They define the boundary of what the patentee owns.
- Claims in a patent describe the metes and bounds of an invention.
- All claims have three principal components: a preamble, a transitional phrase, and a body.
- Start broad, get narrow.
- Target 15-20 claims (three independent, rest dependent).
- PTO examiners determine claims' broadest reasonable construction to decide whether they are patentable.
- This standard is different from the one courts use to decide if the patent is invalid or infringed.

Background of Invention

- Discuss the current technology
- "Problem/Solution"
- Cite references, if known
- You do not need to do extensive search and analysis

Search, read, and compare the "prior art". Who is "one of ordinary skill" in the art? Explain the new idea as if you were telling someone about the technology. Point out the novel way you solved the "problem" of the existing technology.
- Be specific: describe the invention thoroughly
- Be broad: provide examples and alternatives
- Chose language and words carefully
- Avoid contradictions and abbreviations
- Keep background section short
- Don't use limiting words
- Avoid slang, idioms, homographs
- Use technical language

The Written Description

Minimize discussion of advantages and objects of invention.
### Patenting Life

The Human Genome Project.

### Patenting Animals - The Harvard Mouse

*The Harvard Mouse*

### Of Men in Mice: Born to Die!

**The World's First Patented Animal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Name</td>
<td>OncoMouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Patent Number</td>
<td>4,734,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Issue</td>
<td>April 12, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Breast Cancer Research Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Contain a Variety of Genes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost</td>
<td>About $50 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventors</td>
<td>Philip Lader (Harvard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timothy sentence (Genentech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Rate</td>
<td>Close to 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>About One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent Assigned to</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed to</td>
<td>DuPont Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patenting Human Genes

"I'll never work out. She's patented, he isn't."

"...and do you take this man, facts of whom are patented by the Genoscope Company."
Despite being an extremely active area for patent applications, nanotechnology development is being impaired by current intellectual property law. In contrast to other emerging fields at their times, nanotechnology was born as the Bayh-Dole Act enabled universities to lock down fundamental research effectively preventing open competition. Both technical complexity and bureaucratic mishandling of nanotechnology patent applications have created a dense patent thicket of overlapping claims and rights.
Is the US Patent System Broken?

The United States patent system is broken and desperately needs fixing. Why are so many bad patents being issued? Under our current system, inventors can apply with little scrutiny and less time than subjected to rigorous review. The examiners are unable to perform more than cursory searches of these overwhelming patent applications. Patent attorneys—nonpractitioners and examiners—are generally excluded from the patent examination process, even though these parties have the greatest incentive to discover the prior art and disclose it to the Patent Office in order to prevent bad patents from being issued.

Due Diligence is Critical for commercialization

![Diagram of nanotechnology research open-source]

To drive innovation at the nanoscale, the patent thicket must be channeled down, argues Joshua M. Pearce.

**Summary**
- Basic nanotechnology is widely patented.
- Many inventors are misled into using “building blocks” technologies.
- Downstream development of ideas may be stifled as a result.
- Publicly funded nanotechnology research should be open access.
- There should be a moratorium on patenting basic nanotechnology.

22 November 2012 | Vol 419 | Nature | 310

**Fig. 2** US patent thicket analysis by nanomaterial technology sector. (Courtesy of Lux Research, New York, NY, and Foley Lardner, Washington, DC.)
TABLE 27.4
Inventor’s Reality Checklist and Complex Marketing Factors

- Does the invention offer a unique solution to a real problem?
- Does it offer a measurable improvement over previous attempts to solve the problem?
- Is it a stand-alone product or part of an existing product?
- Can it be easily manufactured or integrated into an existing product or system?
- How big is the potential market?
- Is the market growing or shrinking?
- Is the market global? Can the invention be expanded into new markets as they evolve?
- Will the invention become passé before a prototype is designed?
- Who are the prospective investors, partners, or licensing agents in the field?
- What price will consumers pay for it?
- What are the estimates for commercialization and marketing?
- What are the incentives for the consumer to buy the product?
- Is federal regulatory approval required?
- How long will it take to bring the product to market?

Source: Raj Bawa, 2013

---

Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times.

—Thomas Jefferson, 1816

Should we revise intellectual property and statutes? The best answer will arise when the legal issue is focused by previous conversations among science, business, economics and law. Neither courts nor legislatures may find wise answers in the absence of such earlier interaction.

—Hon. Stephen Breyer, Supreme Court Justice, 2000

---

Patent Strategy is Critical for Eventual Market Entry
QUIZ 1

1. Which of the following is true (select all that apply):
   a. The US Patent & Trademark Office is part of the US Department of Justice.
   b. Patents represent a form of intellectual property.
   c. A US patent provides protection both in the US and abroad.

2. Which of the following is true (select all that apply):
   a. Patent expiration on numerous blockbusters drugs in recent years is altering the drug R&D landscape.
   b. An invention on a drug formulation must be both novel and nonobvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.
   c. Depending on the invention, a patent application when filed at the US Patent Office may lack utility (usefulness).

3. Which of the following is true (select all that apply):
   a. Patent agents and patent lawyers are often referred to as patent practitioners.
   b. Examiners at the Patent Office determine claims’ broadest reasonable construction to decide whether there is patentable subject matter submitted in a patent application.
   c. As in real property, the claims stake out the patent holder’s territory, and any encroachment on that territory constitutes patent infringement.
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MODULE 2

Hatch-Waxman Act
DRUG PRICE COMPETITION AND PATENT TERM RESTORATION ACT OF 1984

Srikumaran Melethil, Ph.D., J.D.
INTRODUCTION

Scientists Invent

Lawyers Patent

“Because there is a general lack of understanding of each culture, these interactions often lead to a cognitive friction that is both disturbing and costly to society.” (emphasis added)

A Convergence of Science and Law (National Academy Press, 2001)
Patent Claims

To coin a phrase, the name of the game is the claim


Meaning of words often the grounds for patent infringement disputes

Which word is open to interpretation?

**Claim 2.**

A touch probe . . . the probe generating a trigger signal when said sensing tip contacts an object . . .  
(Touch Probe, US Patent No. 5,491,904)

[Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' Per Azioni 158 F.3d. 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998)]
Patent claims define boundaries of an invention ("metes and bounds")

Infringement: Like Trespassing

CLAIMING YOUR INVENTION
AN EXAMPLE

METHOD FOR TREATING PAIN BY ADMINISTERING 24 HOUR ORAL OPIOID FORMULATIONS

- US Patent No. 5,672, 360
- Issued: 9/30/1997
- Inventors: Richard S. Sackler, Robert F. Kalko and Paul Goldenhelm
- Assignee: Purdue Pharma L.P.
Claims

What is claimed is:

1. A method of effectively treating pain in humans comprising orally administering to a human on a once-a-day basis an oral sustained release dosage form containing an opioid analgesic or salt thereof which upon administration provides a time to maximum plasma concentration (Tmax) of said opioid in about 2 to about 10 hours and a maximum plasma concentration (Cmax) which is more than twice the plasma level of said opioid at about 24 hours after administration of the dosage form, and which dosage form provides effective treatment of pain for about 24 hours or more after administration to the patient. (emphasis added)

Claims (cont’d)

2. The method of claim 1, wherein Tmax occurs in about 2 to about 8 hours after oral administration of said dosage form

3. The method of claim 1, wherein Tmax occurs in about 6 to about 8 hours after oral administration of said dosage form

Claims (cont’d)

4. The method of claim 1 wherein the said opioid analgesic is morphine sulfate
H-W POLICY ISSUES

To Protect Intellectual Property
  – Encourage Innovation

To Foster Competition
  - Marketing Generics
    (Consumer Benefit)

Patents and H-W Act
(where drug and patent laws meet)

- NDAs (New Drug Applications) are required to include:
  - patent number and
  - expiration date of any patent that claims either
    the drug (active ingredient and/or composition or formulation) or
    method of use (i.e., indication)

Patents and H-W Act (cont’d)

FDA required to list the submitted patent information in its “Orange” book

Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations
H-W Certifications

A generic company (the ANDA/503(b)2 applicant) must certify that drug:
I) has not been patented;
II) patent has expired;
III) patent will expire on a given date and that generic will not be marketed prior to that date; OR
IV) patent is not infringed or invalid - (where the action is!)

Paragraph IV Certification

Generic company:
- must notify innovator about ANDA filing
- must explain:
  * why generic product will not infringe innovator patent OR
  * why innovator patent is invalid

Under the H-W Act, filing such an ANDA is open to infringement challenges by the patentee.

THE PROZAC® CASE
INVALIDITY-DOUBLE PATENTING

FACTS
- Fluoxetine (active ingredient of "blockbuster" Prozac®)
- Barr Labs submitted ANDA in December 1995 for generic fluoxetine with ¶ IV certification
- Lilly brought action alleging Barr’s ANDA application infringed its patents
Obviousness-type Double Patenting

“[T]he extension of exclusive rights through claims in a later patent that are not patentably distinct for claims in an earlier patent.”
(222 F.3d at 985)

Issue for CAFC
222 F.3d. 973 (2000) – Part I

To determine whether Claim 1 of the ‘895 patent covers subject matter claimed in claim 7 of the ‘549 patent (the later patent)

A method of blocking the uptake of serotonin by brain neurons in animals comprising the administering to said animal of fluoxetine (claim 7, ‘549 patent) (emphasis added)

A method of treating human suffering from depression which comprises administering to said human of an effective antidepressant dose of fluoxetine (claim 1,’895 patent) (emphasis added)
Issue for CAFC
251 F.3d 955 (2001) – Part II

To determine whether Claim 1 of the ‘213 patent covers subject matter claimed in claim 7 of the ‘549 patent (the later patent)

A method of blocking the uptake of serotonin by brain neurons in animals comprising the administering to said animal of fluoxetine (claim 7, ‘549 patent) (emphasis added)

A method for treating anxiety in a human subject in need of such treatment which comprises the administration to such human an effective amount of fluoxetine or norfluoxetine or pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof (claim 1, ‘213 patent) (emphasis added)

Decision – Lilly Loses

The subject of claim 7 of the ‘549 patent is obvious because it is covered by the claims from the ‘895 and ‘213 patents. Therefore, the ‘549 patent is invalid for double patenting
The Prilosec® Case
NON-INFRINGEMENT

Facts
- Omeprazole – active ingredient of “blockbuster” Prilosec®
- Kremers Urban Development Co. (KUDCo.) submitted ANDA for generic omeprazole with ¶ IV certification
- Patent holder Astra Aktiebolag, owner of US Patents Nos. 4,786,505 (the ‘505 patent and 4,853,230 (the ‘230 patent) filed an infringement suit against KUDCo.

Prilosec® Case (cont’d)
222 F. Supp.2d 423 (S.D.N.Y. 2002)

The main issue:
- Did the KUDCo formulation core contain an alkaline reacting compound (ARC)?

Prilosec® Case (cont’d)

Claim 1 of the ‘505 patent states (in part):
- An oral pharmaceutical preparation comprising:
  - (a) a core region comprising an effective amount of a material selected from the group consisting of omeprazole plus an alkaline reacting compound, an alkaline omeprazole salt plus an alkaline reacting compound and an omeprazole salt alone; (emphasis added) . . .
Prilosec® Case (cont’d)

- Formulation Differences
  - Core Composition
- KUDCo microtablet has 3 parts:
  - A core, a subcoat and enteric coat
  - The court concluded that the subcoat and the enteric coat of the microtablet do not differ from the ‘505 patent

Prilosec® Case (cont’d)

DECISION (affirmed by CAFC in 2003)

Astra loses: KUDCo can market generic omeprazole.

The Court concluded that the KUDCo tablet did not have an ARC in its core. Therefore, the generic version of KUDCo did not infringe Astra's patent.

Weakness of Formulation Patents: They can be DESIGNED AROUND.

Prilosec® Case (cont’d)

- There were 3 other generic companies that had also filed ANDAs
  - Andrx Pharmaceuticals, Cheminor Drugs, and Genpharm, Inc.

They all were found to infringe on several of the claims of the Astra patent(s)
Summary

1. Effective communication between research scientists and patent attorneys is essential for patent protection.
2. Multiple patents on based on a single chemical entity is vulnerable to double patenting.
3. Formulation patents can be defeated by designing around them.

QUIZ 2

1. The Hatch-Waxman Act was enacted to:
   a. Promote drug innovation
   b. Foster competition through generics
   c. Both (a) and (b) above

2. One weakness of a formulation patent is that it can be "defeated" by designing around it.
   a. True
   b. False

3. Under paragraph IV certification, a company must explain why:
   a. Its generic version does not infringe the patent(s) listed for the brand name drug
   b. The patent(s) listed for the brand name drug is/are invalid
   c. Both (a) or (b) above
### Safe Harbor Provisions

It shall not be an act of infringement to make, use, offer to sell, or sell within the United States or import into the United States a patented invention . . . solely for uses reasonably related to the development and submission of information under a Federal law which regulates the manufacture, use, or sale of drugs or veterinary biological products. (emphasis added)  

(35 U.S.C. 271(e)(1))

---

### Safe Harbor Provisions (cont’d)

Enacted by Congress primarily to overrule Roche v. Bolar (733 F.2d. 858) (Fed. Cir. 1984)  

Applying patent law*, Bolar was found by CAFC to have infringed Roche’s patent on flurazepam because it initiated ANDA studies before the expiry of the patent.  

* . . . “whoever without authority . . . uses . . . any patented invention, within the United States during the term of the patent therefor, infringes the patent.”  

35 U.S.C §271(a)
Merck v. Integra

FACTS

1. Integra Life Sciences owns several (5) patents covering the “RGD” peptide.

2. Scripps researcher discovers that a cyclic RGD (EMD 66203) peptide provided by collaborator Merck can inhibit tumor growth in chickens (inhibition of angiogenesis).

Merck v. Integra (cont’d)

FACTS (cont’d)

3. Scripps then focused on developing EMD peptides as a potential drug candidates.

4. Integra files patent infringement suit against Merck and Scripps.

Question for the Court

Were the drug discovery activities of Merck and Scripps protected from infringement of the Integra patents?
**Merck v. Integra (cont’d)**

**At the District Court:**

Integra wins:

a. Merck activities infringed Integra’s patents.

b. Integra was awarded $15 million in damages (1998), later reduced to $6.375 million (2004).

---

**Merck v. Integra (cont’d)**

331 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir., June 6, 2003)

At the appeals court (CAFC), Integra is still the winner:

1. Lower court’s ruling on infringement is affirmed

2. Remanded to lower court to reconsider infringement award because Integra purchased all the infringing patents and products from Telios for $20,000,000.

---

**Merck v. Integra**

543 U.S.193 (2005)

At the Supreme Court:

Integra Loses

It overturned patent infringement ruling of lower courts, stating:

“Congress did not limit § 271(e)(1)’s safe harbor to development of information for inclusion in a submission to the FDA; nor did it create an exemption applicable only to research relevant to filing an ANDA for approval for a generic drug.”
Patentable Subject Matter
("101" issue"")

"[L]aws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas are not patentable"


---

**Mayo v. Prometheus**

**FACTS:**
Mayo Clinic used diagnostic tests sold by Prometheus Laboratories based their two patents: U.S. No. 6,355,623 (the '623 patent), and 6,680,302 (the '302 patent).
Mayo stated in 2004 that it planned to market its own version of a similar diagnostic test.
Prometheus filed infringement suit against Mayo

---

**Mayo v. Prometheus (cont’d)**

The Court examined claim 1 of the ‘623 patent (considered “typical”), which states:

“A method of optimizing therapeutic efficacy for treatment of an immune-mediated gastrointestinal disorder, comprising:

(a) administering a drug providing 6-thioguanine to a subject having said immune-mediated gastrointestinal disorder, and
(b) Determining the level of 6-thioguanine in said subject having said immune-mediated gastrointestinal disorder,

"wherein the level of 6-thioguanine less than about 230 pmol per 8X10^8 indicates a need to increase the amount of said drug subsequently administered to said subject, and

"wherein the level of 6-thioguanine greater than about 400 pmol per 8X10^8 indicates a need to decrease the amount of said drug subsequently administered to said subject."

---
1. District Court: Mayo Wins.

It concluded that claims of the ‘623 patent, which deal with concentration-effect relationships, belong to natural laws, and thus, were not patentable.

CAFC: Prometheus Wins:

It reversed lower court ruling, using the "machine or transformation" test for process claims.

The Machine or Transformation test:

A process can patented, only if

(a) "it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or

(b) it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing."

In re Bilski, 545 F3d. 934,954 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (en banc)
Mayo v. Prometheus (cont’d)

Supreme Court: Mayo Wins:

In reversing CAFC, it said:

While “the 'machine-or-transformation' test is an ‘important and useful clue' to patentability, we have neither said or implied that the test trumps the 'law of nature’ exclusion” (566 U.S. ___ (2012)

Obviousness (Obvious to try)

“When there is a design need or market pressure to solve problem, and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has a good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In that instance the fact that a combination was obvious to try might show that it was obvious under §103.” (emphasis added)


Bayer Pharma v. Barr Laboratories

FACTS:

Barr filed an ANDA to market a generic version of Yasmin®.

Bayer files suit under the Hatch-Waxman Act alleging that Barr’s product will infringe its U.S. Patent No. 6,787,531 (the ’531 patent)
Bayer Pharma v. Barr Laboratories  
(575 F3d. 1341) (2009)

Claim 1, representative of the '531 patent:
A pharmaceutical composition comprising from about 2 mg to 4 mg of micronized drospirenone particles, about 0.01 mg to about 0.05 mg of 17α-ethynylestradiol, and one or more pharmaceutically acceptable carriers, the composition being in an oral dosage form exposed to the gastric environment upon dissolution and the composition being effective for oral contraception in a human female. (emphasis added)

Drospirenone Pharmacokinetic Properties

1. Poorly water soluble (hence, micronized)  
2. Acid labile (isomerizes at pH 1, in vitro)  
3. Absorbed equally well in-vivo (with or without enteric coating)  
4. It properties similar to spirorenone (prior art)

Drospirenone  
Molecular Formula: C_{24}H_{30}O_{3}  
Molecular Weight: 366.4932

Spirorenone  
Molecular Formula: C_{24}H_{28}O_{3}  
Molecular Weight: 364.47732
Applying the "obvious to try" standard, the '531 patent was found to be invalid for obviousness by both the trial (district) court and CAFC.

QUIZ 3
1. Which of the following are not patentable?
   a. Laws of nature  
   b. Natural phenomena  
   c. Both (a) and (b) above

2. A recent Supreme Court decision (Merck v. Integra) has ______ the scope of the safe harbor provisions.
   a. Narrowed  
   b. Broadened

3. The "obvious to try" standard for patentability (stated by the Supreme Court in the KSR decision) makes obtaining a patent ______ difficult.
   a. More  
   b. Less

Summary
Supreme Court decisions have:
   a. broadened the scope of the safe harbor provisions, making it "easier" to avoid infringement when using patented information
   b. the "obvious to try" standard for obviousness can patenting an invention more difficult
   c. Patent eligibility of inventions is likely to receive stricter scrutiny
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