"Should I Really Be Searching Patents?" – Abstracts

A one day overview for librarians, information scientists, researchers and anyone with an interest in understanding the patent literature relevant to chemistry.

Wednesday 28th October 2009 at RSC, Burlington House, London

Meeting Chairman: Dr Diana Leitch, Information Consultant

Stephen Adams, Managing Director, Magister Ltd., Reading, "Patent Myths and Misconceptions – Why Should I Bother?"

If the popular press deals with patents at all, it is usually in a negative context, implying abuses of monopoly rights by multi-national businesses, or high-cost high-profile litigation. But patents can deliver very strong rights and advantages to small business as well. A potential applicant needs to understand the basic operation of the patent system in order to understand what patents can and cannot do for their business. This means dispelling some of the myths and mystique about the system, from the point of view of both legal rights and information dissemination.

Chris Archer, Senior Patent Examiner, Intellectual Property Office, Newport, "Searching Chemical Patent Applications at the Intellectual Property Office"

An overview of how chemical patent applications are searched at the Intellectual Property Office. This will include the searching of specialist patent databases as well as non-patent documentation to determine if a patent claim is new and inventive. Searching is performed using a variety of tools, search languages and classification schemes in order to produce comprehensive search results. A brief overview of our Search and Advisory Service is included.

Yvonne Pope, International Regional Marketing Manager, CAS, U.K., "I Should Really Be Searching Patents"

With more than 70% of all new chemical entities in the CAS Registry file originating from patents and with CAS having recently registered its 50-millionth small molecule, there is much to gain and a lot to lose by not searching patents. The rise is non-English language patents (e.g. 19.8% published patents abstracted by CAS in 2008 were Chinese-language) adds a further dimension. Ignoring China for a moment, what is the main language used by mainland European pharma companies for their patent applications? Not always English! Maybe your scientists find patents a challenging read? In this short presentation, we will consider how the value-added abstract and indexing of specific compounds in the CAS databases can assist in understanding patents written in any language.

Stefan Roller, Senior Project Manager, Software Development, Elsevier Information Systems GmbH, Frankfurt, Germany, "Using Reaxys for Searching Chemistry in Patents"

In the past (1980ies and earlier), patents only played a secondary role for the chemistry information. This has changed dramatically in the meanwhile, and patents today are the major source for information about new substances and chemical reactions. Reaxys is Elsevier's leading platform for providing insights into organic, organo-metallic and inorganic structures and their reactions and properties indexed from both journal and patent sources. The talk will present Reaxys features from patents as Markush structures, detailed reaction descriptions and multistep reactions, and give an outlook to the enhancements coming soon.

Steve Hajkowski, Product Manager CPI & Online, Thomson Reuters, London, "Overview of Chemistry Content within the Derwent World Patents Index (DWPI)"

The session will present an analysis of the chemical information available within patents, including a breakdown of novelty type and global trends. The benefits of accessing this information *via* a fully indexed value-add database (Derwent World Patents Index, DWPI) will also be discussed.

Dr John Barnard, Scientific Director, Digital Chemistry Ltd., Leeds, "Markush Structure Searching"

Systems for handling the Markush structures found in patents were a very active area for research and development in the 1980s. However, the commercial systems that became operational at the end of that period have changed little since, and are now showing their age. The deficiencies of these systems for handling modern chemical patents make life difficult for searchers. Several groups are currently working on new approaches to handling the structural information in chemical patents, and these are reviewed in this presentation.

Stuart Newbold, Information Manager, Astex Therapeutics, Cambridge, "Marpat Searching in Context: Creating the Ideal Answer Set and Beyond"

Neil Edwards, Senior Information Scientist, Johnson Matthey, Forecasting and Information Department, Sonning Common, "Patent Analysis and Mapping"

Patent data is freely available and analysis may be carried out with nothing more than an Internet connection and a spreadsheet program; but without an understanding of the patent cycle, the richness of the information and its potential gaps those analyses can be misleading. Simple patent counting is rarely sufficient to understand trends and to interpret those results. This presentation is aimed more at those new to the area rather than experienced users and is intended to highlight some of the pitfalls and potential uses of patent data. A brief introduction to patent maps using commercial software is included.

Michelle Pratt, Chartered and European Patent Attorney, Chemical & Materials Group, Boult Wade Tennant (Patent Attorneys to the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC), Daresbury Laboratory), London, "Freedom-to-Operate Searching"

A patent right is a negative right: it can be used by the owner to stop others from using, making, selling a patented product/process. A patent does not give the owner the right to commercialise the product/process. Freedom-to-Operate searching is used to identify third party patent rights in order to assess the risk of patent infringement.

Professor Graham Richards, CBE, Department of Chemistry, University of Oxford, "Commercialising Chemistry"

The Oxford Chemistry Department has been very successful in commercializing intellectual property developed in its laboratories, earning more than £80 million for the University. Just how this has been achieved will be described, including the importance of clarity in the ownership of IP and the revenue sharing both for spin-out companies and in licensing.