UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
18/306,074	04/24/2023	Katherine Yerre Koehler	0546-US08CON	2826

184103 7590 10/19/2026

PATTERSON + SHERIDAN, L.L.P. - Dexcom
24 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1600
Houston, TX 77046

EXAMINER
JANG, CHRISTIAN Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3791	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/19/2026	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Dexcom.pair@anaqua.com
Dexcom@pattersonsheridan.com
pair_eofficeaction@pattersonsheridan.com

Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 18/306,074	Applicant(s) Koehler et al.		
	Examiner CHRISTIAN JANG	Art Unit 3791	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status Yes	Page 1 of 2

All Participants (applicant, applicants representative, PTO personnel)	Title	Type
CHRISTIAN JANG	Primary Examiner	Telephonic
Paul Klecha	Attorney	
Melissa Patterson	Attorney	
Simon Ford	Attorney	
Sepp Zangeneh	Attorney	

Date of Interview: 15 October 2026

Issues Discussed:

35 U.S.C. 103

Applicant has argued the following:

In particular, Mittal determines whether a battery is expected to be depleted before a next anticipated charging opportunity, rather than determining whether the computing device has insufficient battery power to provide the recited alerting through the end of the claimed predetermined time period.

Mittal explicIty states that it determines a "threshold amount of charge required to enable use of the PE device from a current time to at least an end of the future interval" ([0067]; Fig. 7 - 704). It also states that a future interval can refer to a "defined period of time in the future" with a starting point and ending point of a fixed relationship ([0027]). The next-charging-opportunity version that applicant points to is only one alternative.

The examiner also noted that [0115] and [0150] of Saidara may still be pertinent to the proposed amendment limitations under (2) and (3).

Proposed Amendment(s)

Proposed amendment to claim 21 would remove any active steps (i.e. adjusting and determining) and would be a passive description of the time period (during which ... high glucose alerts are deactivated, thresholds are adjusted, and device has insufficient battery power"). There is nothing within the proposed amendment that states that the processor actually deactivates, adjusts, or determines anything.

As a result, it is unclear whether these are method steps or just characteristics of the period, likely requiring a 112b rejection. It arguably broadens the claims on the battery limitation, since there's no requirement of the determination. Applicant is advised to recite each step positively as a step that is performed by the at least one processor.

Proposed claim 42 (or 44, see below), and its limitation of having different monitoris and different alerts per threshold is not addressed by the prior art of record and will require further search and/or consideration. Applicant is also requested to provide where in the disclosure provides written description support for such a feature.

Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 18/306,074	Applicant(s) Koehler et al.		
	Examiner CHRISTIAN JANG	Art Unit 3791	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status Yes	Page 2 of 2

Other

Examiner noted that claim 42 remains pending, so the proposed "new" claim should be claim 44, unless applicant intends on cancelling claim 42.

Examiner notes that a portion of rejection of claim 39 appears to have been accidentally deleted - it should have said that the "the claimed system comprises only a memory storing executable instructions and at least one processor coupled to the memory". No battery or other power source is positively recited. It is therefore unclear what structure is being evaluated for sufficient battery power, and what is being charged.

☑ Attachment

/CHRISTIAN JANG/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3791	

Applicant is reminded that a complete written statement as to the substance of the interview must be made of record in the application file. It is the applicants responsibility to provide the written statement, unless the interview was initiated by the Examiner and the Examiner has indicated that a written summary will be provided. See MPEP 713.04
Please further see:
MPEP 713.04
Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews, paragraph (b)
37 CFR § 1.2 Business to be transacted in writing

Applicant recordation instructions: The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.