EXHIBIT C

Interview Summary	Application No. 11/512,529	Applicant(s) HICKS ET AL.	
	Examiner TRANG NGUYEN	Art Unit 3686	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *TRANG NGUYEN*.

(2) *JERRY O'CONNOR*.

(3) *Timothy Scull (REG NO. 42,137)*.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: *10 March 2010*.

Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *1 and 19*.

Identification of prior art discussed: *Henley (US 2003/0195838 A1)*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *Discussed proposed amendment to the claims*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

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. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/T. N./ Examiner, Art Unit 3686	/Jerry O'Connor/ SPE, GAU 3686

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record
A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews
Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.
All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:
- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:
1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
2) an identification of the claims discussed,
3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

S/N 11/512,529

PATENT
CONF. NO. 1358

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	David G. Hicks, et al.	Examiner:	Trang T. Nguyen
Serial No.:	11/512,529	Group Art Unit:	3686
Filed:	August 29, 2006	Docket No.:	40476.0002USU1
Title:	**INTERNET SYSTEM FOR CONNECTING HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS AND PATIENTS**		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being transmitted electronically via EFS-Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 12, 2010.

By: Halina Wohl
Name: Halina Wohl

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

The undersigned, Timothy Scull, thanks Examiner Nguyen and Examiner O'Connor for their time and cooperation in the in-person interview held on March 10, 2010. During the interview, the undersigned provided a summary of the embodiments of the above-identified application. The undersigned also distinguished the above-identified application from the art cited in the Office Action mailed on November 13, 2009, in which such cited art included U.S. Pat. App. Publ. No. 2003/0195838 to Henley; U.S. Pat. App. Publ. No. 2006/0080146 to Cook; and U.S. Pat. App. Publ. No. 2004/0010423 to Sameh. The Examiners and the undersigned also discussed the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections, 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections, and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections from the Office Action mailed November 13, 2009. Further, the claim amendments submitted in the Amendment and Response filed on February 16, 2010 were also discussed. No agreement was reached.

Application Serial No. 11/512,529

The undersigned again thanks Examiner Nguyen and Examiner O'Connor for their time in the in-person interview.

23552
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(303) 357-1648

By: _____
Timothy B. Scull, Reg. No. 42,137

Date: April 12, 2010

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	7399365
Application Number:	11512529
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1358
Title of Invention:	Internet system for connecting healthcare providers and patients
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	David G. Hicks
Customer Number:	23552
Filer:	Timothy Brian Scull/Halina Wohl
Filer Authorized By:	Timothy Brian Scull
Attorney Docket Number:	40476.0002USU1
Receipt Date:	12-APR-2010
Filing Date:	29-AUG-2006
Time Stamp:	18:31:01
Application Type:	Utility under 35 USC 111(a)

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Applicant summary of interview with examiner	StmtSubstanceInterview_04122010.PDF	55438 2b9ea18e83982b5cb0d05b0654c49aa296487070	no	2

Warnings:

Information:

Total Files Size (in bytes):	55438

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111
If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371
If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office
If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.

S/N 11/512,529

PATENT
CONF. NO. 1358

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	David G. Hicks, et al.	Examiner:	Trang T. Nguyen
Serial No.:	11/512,529	Group Art Unit:	3686
Filed:	August 29, 2006	Docket No.:	40476.0002USU1
Title:	**INTERNET SYSTEM FOR CONNECTING HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS AND PATIENTS**		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being transmitted electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.6(a)(4) on April 26, 2010.

By: _____
Name: Halina Wohl

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Supplemental Amendment is being filed following an in-person interview conducted with Examiners Nguyen and O'Connor on March 10, 2010. This Supplemental Amendment supplements the Amendment & Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on February 16, 2010 in reply to the Office Action dated November 13, 2009. Please amend the above-identified application as indicated below. It is believed that no further fees are due with this Supplemental Amendment. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 9 of this paper.

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	7486741
Application Number:	11512529
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1358
Title of Invention:	Internet system for connecting healthcare providers and patients
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	David G. Hicks
Customer Number:	23552
Filer:	Timothy Brian Scull/Halina Wohl
Filer Authorized By:	Timothy Brian Scull
Attorney Docket Number:	40476.0002USU1
Receipt Date:	26-APR-2010
Filing Date:	29-AUG-2006
Time Stamp:	14:59:12
Application Type:	Utility under 35 USC 111(a)

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Supplemental Response or Supplemental Amendment	SuppAmendment_04262010.PDF	696419 e9c5301a96e4c9a74d40119a3b918a0e55d30af8	no	14

Warnings:

Information:

Total Files Size (in bytes):	696419

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111
If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371
If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office
If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.

REMARKS

This Supplemental Amendment is being filed to supplement the Amendment & Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on February 16, 2010 in reply to the Office Action dated November 13, 2009. The amendments and remarks being submitted herein are in addition to those submitted on February 16, 2010. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination based on the amendments and remarks filed on February 16, 2010 and on the amendments and remarks submitted in this Supplemental Amendment.

In this Supplemental Amendment, claims 1-3, 8-11, 13, 15, and 19-21 have been amended. Claims 5 and 16-18 remain cancelled without prejudice. No claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-15, and 19-21 remain present for examination. This application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 13-15, & 19

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 13-15, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Henley in view of Cook. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the references must teach or suggest each and every one of the claim elements to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. *See* MPEP §§ 2142, 2143.03; *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (C.C. P.A. 1970). In addition, *KSR International Company v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007), requires that there "must be some *articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning* to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." (Emphasis added.) Further, "a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art." *KSR Int'l Co.*, 127 S. Ct. at 1741. Specifically, the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements.

For example, Henley in view of Cook fail to teach or suggest at least the following with respect to claim 1:

. . .

> *receiving, by a Web server computer of a company providing a service for connecting healthcare providers with the potential patients*, a request for information regarding a first healthcare provider, wherein the Web server computer comprises at least one computer processor and memory;
>
> accessing healthcare provider-verified information about the first healthcare provider, *wherein the healthcare provider-verified information is*

> *received from the first healthcare provider and comprises three or more from the group consisting of: specialty information, medical philosophy, gender, age, years in profession, years in practice, awards, honors, professional appointments, professional memberships, publications, languages, and hobbies;*
>
> compiling, by the at least one computer processor, patient-provided information regarding the first healthcare provider, wherein the patient-provided information comprises patient ratings from one or more past or current patients of the first healthcare provider, and *wherein the patient ratings are received from an on-line patient experience survey completed on a company Web site by the one or more past or current patients of the first healthcare provider, and wherein the company Web site is managed by the company providing the service for connecting healthcare providers with the potential patients*;
>
> *compiling information regarding the first healthcare provider verified by an independent third-party source, wherein the information verified by the independent third-party source comprises three or more from the group consisting of: board certification, licensure, disciplinary action information, medical school, medical internship, medical residency, and medical fellowship information;*
>
> *creating*, by the at least one computer processor, *a healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider using the healthcare provider-verified information, the patient-provided information, and the information verified by the independent third-party source*, wherein the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider includes *comparison ratings* of healthcare providers;
>
> . . . .

Claim 1, supra (as amended) (emphasis added).

As discussed previously, Henley provides for the on-line negotiation of fees for medical services and products to ". . . enable prospective patients to easily identify and access an otherwise underutilized medical facility to negotiate a favorable fee for services subject to scheduling restrictions and other 'specifications' set by the medical service provider." *Henley, at [0024]*. Henley is thus related to on-line auctioning of medical services and products and fails to disclose or suggest at least: ". . . creating, by the at least one computer processor, *a healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider using the healthcare provider-verified information, the patient-provided information, and the information verified by the independent third-party source*, wherein the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider includes *comparison ratings* of healthcare providers . . . ."

Further, Cook fails to cure the deficiencies of Henley. As discussed previously, Cook relates generally to "electronic medical records" and enabling a patient "to choose a healthcare provider who uses an EMR [('electronic medical record')] system and optionally an advanced, compatible EMR system." *Cook, at [0097]*. Cook fails to provide any teaching or suggestion, at

a minimum, of ". . . creating, by the at least one computer processor, *a healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider using the healthcare provider-verified information, the patient-provided information, and the information verified by the independent third-party source*, wherein the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider includes *comparison ratings* of healthcare providers . . . ."

Accordingly, Henley in view of Cook fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1, and allowance of this claim is therefore respectfully requested. While the above discussion shows that the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every aspect of claim 1, amendments to claim 1 are made in the interest only of forwarding the prosecution of this application to allowance and are not necessarily made to address the Office Action's rejections based on the cited references. Amendments are therefore made without prejudice. Because claims 2-4 and 6-15 depend on allowable base claim 1, these claims are also allowable, and such action is respectfully requested. As such, any remaining arguments supporting the rejections of these claims are not acquiesced to even though they are not directly addressed herein. Applicants thus respectfully request the allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-15 (claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice).

In addition, for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, Henley in view of Cook fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 19. For example, Henley in view of Cook fail to teach or suggest at least the following with respect to claim 19:

> . . .
>
> receive a request for information regarding a first healthcare provider;
>
> access healthcare provider-verified information about the first healthcare provider, *wherein the healthcare provider-verified information is received from the first healthcare provider and comprises three or more from the group consisting of: specialty information, medical philosophy, gender, age, years in profession, years in practice, awards, honors, professional appointments, professional memberships, publications, languages, and hobbies*;
>
> compile patient-provided information regarding the first healthcare provider, wherein the patient-provided information comprises patient ratings from one or more past or current patients of the first healthcare provider, and *wherein the patient ratings are received from an on-line patient experience survey completed on a company Web site by the one or more past or current patients of the first healthcare provider, and wherein the company Web site is managed by the company providing the service for connecting healthcare providers with the potential patients*;
>
> *compile healthcare provider information regarding the first*

> *healthcare provider verified by an independent third-party source, wherein the information verified by the independent third-party source comprises three or more from the group consisting of: board certification, licensure, disciplinary action information, medical school, medical internship, medical residency, and medical fellowship information*;
>
> *create a healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider using the healthcare provider-verified information, the patient-provided information, and the information verified by the independent third-party source*, wherein the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider includes *comparison ratings* of healthcare providers;
>
> . . . .

Claim 19, supra (as amended) (emphasis added).

Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to those discussed above, Henley in view of Cook fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 19. This claim is therefore allowable. Because claims 20-21 depend on allowable base claim 19, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons presented above, and such action is respectfully requested. As such, any remaining arguments supporting the rejections of these claims are not acquiesced to even though they are not addressed herein. As noted, while the above discussion shows that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 19, amendments to the claims are made in the interest only of forwarding the prosecution of this application to allowance and are not necessarily made to address the Office Action's rejections based on the cited references. Amendments are therefore made without prejudice.

For at least the reasons presented above, claims 1-4, 6-15, and 19-21 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 7, 10-12, & 20

Claims 7, 10-12, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Henley in view of Cook and further in view of Sameh. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections. The cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements.

Because claims 7, 10-12, and 20 depend on allowable base claims 1 and 19, respectively, *see discussion supra*, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons presented above, and such action is respectfully requested. As such, any remaining arguments supporting the rejections of these claims are not acquiesced to even though they are not directly addressed herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claims 7, 10-12, and 20.

Further, Sameh fails to cure the deficiencies of Henley in view of Cook. As discussed previously, Sameh relates generally to allowing patients "to make appointments with physicians." *Sameh, at [0002]*. Sameh fails to provide any teaching or suggestion, for example, of: ". . . creating, by the at least one computer processor, *a healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider using the healthcare provider-verified information, the patient-provided information, and the information verified by the independent third-party source*, wherein the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider includes *comparison ratings* of healthcare providers . . . ." *See, e.g., claim 1, supra (as amended) (emphasis added) (upon which claims 7 & 10-12 depend); see also claim 19, supra (as amended) (upon which claim 20 depends).*

Accordingly, Henley in view of Cook and further in view of Sameh fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 7, 10-12, and 20. Claims 7, 10-12, and 20 are therefore allowable. While the above discussion shows that the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 7, 10-12, and 20, amendments to claims 7, 10-12, and 20 are made in the interest only of forwarding the prosecution of this application to allowance and are not necessarily made to address the Office Action's rejections based on the cited references. Amendments are therefore made without prejudice.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claims 7, 10-12, and 20.

Conclusion

This Supplemental Amendment supplements the Amendment & Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on February 16, 2010. The amendments and remarks being submitted herein are in addition to those submitted on February 16, 2010. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination. The Office Action dated November 13, 2009 may contain arguments and rejections that are not directly addressed by this Supplemental Amendment or the Amendment & Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on February 16, 2010 due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the arguments made in favor of patentability. Hence, the failure, if any, to directly address an argument and/or comment raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that Applicants believe the argument and/or comment has merit. Additionally, the failure, if any, to address statements and/or comments made in the Office Action does not mean that Applicants acquiesce to such statements

and/or comments. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Supplemental Amendment or the Amendment & Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on February 16, 2010, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

It is believed that no additional fees are due with this Supplemental Amendment. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

The application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 26, 2010



Elizabeth J. Reagan, Reg. No. 57,528
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(303) 357-1644



Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application. Please amend the claims as follows:

Listing of Claims:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method of providing healthcare provider information to potential patients, said method comprising:

receiving, by a Web server computer of a company providing a service for connecting healthcare providers with the potential patients, a request for information regarding a first healthcare provider, wherein the Web server computer comprises at least one computer processor and memory;

accessing ~~compiling~~ healthcare provider-verified information about the first healthcare provider, wherein the healthcare provider-verified information is received from the first healthcare provider and comprises three or more from the group consisting of: specialty information, medical philosophy, gender, age, years in profession, years in practice, awards, honors, professional appointments, professional memberships, publications, languages, and hobbies;

compiling, by the at least one computer processor, ~~past-patient~~ patient-provided information regarding the first healthcare provider, wherein the patient-provided information comprises patient ratings from one or more past or current patients of the first healthcare provider, and wherein the patient ratings are received from an on-line patient experience survey completed on a company Web site by the one or more past or current patients of the first healthcare provider, and wherein the company Web site is managed by the company providing the service for connecting healthcare providers with the potential patients;

compiling information regarding the first healthcare provider verified by an independent

third-party source, ~~sources~~ wherein the information verified by the independent third-party source comprises three or more from the group consisting of: board certification, licensure, disciplinary action information, medical school, medical internship, medical residency, and medical fellowship information;

creating, by [[a]] the at least one computer processor, a healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider using the healthcare provider-verified information, the ~~past-patient~~ patient-provided information, and the information verified by the independent third-party source ~~sources~~, wherein the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider includes comparison ratings of healthcare providers; and

providing access to the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider over a computer network.

2. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the ~~past-patient~~ patient-provided information is obtained through data collected through the method comprising:

the one or more past or current patients of [[a]] the first ~~particular~~ healthcare provider accessing a report [[for]] on the ~~particular~~ first healthcare provider over the computer network;

the one or more past or current patients selecting to complete [[an]] the on-line patient experience survey;

the one or more past or current patients completing the experience survey and providing an e-mail address; and

transmitting the completed experience survey to [[a]] the ~~predetermined company~~ Web server of the company providing the service for connecting healthcare providers with the potential patients.

3. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 2, further comprising a method for

verifying and compiling ~~such~~ the data, the method comprising:

determining whether a first [[the]] past or current patient has ~~already~~ completed a maximum number of surveys for a predetermined time period;

if the first past or current patient has not reached the maximum number of surveys, transmitting a confirmation e-mail to the e-mail address provided;

determining if the confirmation e-mail was successfully transmitted; and

if the e-mail was successfully transmitted, compiling the data provided by the first past or current patient with other relevant data in a company database comprised of healthcare provider information.

4. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the healthcare provider report includes a hyperlink to an affiliated hospital, medical center, or other type of treatment center.

5. (Cancelled)

6. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the access to the healthcare provider report is obtained through a predetermined Web page that provides search capabilities for a database comprised of healthcare provider information.

7. (Previously Presented) The method as defined in claim 6, wherein the search capabilities permit a search based on one or more from the group consisting of: name, medical specialty, gender, state, city, procedure, diagnosis, procedure, and location criteria.

8. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 7, wherein [[a]] the search of the database produces a results list of one or more healthcare providers satisfying the search criteria, wherein the results list includes the first healthcare provider.

9. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 8, wherein the results list further includes an advertisement for [[a]] the first healthcare provider with a hyperlink to information on ~~that~~ the first healthcare provider.

10. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 8, further comprising:

determining from the results list whether a particular healthcare provider is a member of [[a]] the company managing the Web site; and

if the particular healthcare provider is a member of the company managing the Web site, providing enhanced services for the member healthcare provider on the Web site.

11. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 10, wherein the enhanced services comprise making report information on the member healthcare provider available at no charge to the potential patients.

12. (Original) The method as defined in claim 10, wherein the enhanced services comprise favorable positioning in the results list.

13. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 1, further comprising:

maintaining a record of whether the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider should be made available to a first potential patient at no charge; and

requiring payment of a fee to access the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider if the report is not recorded as being available at no charge.

14. (Original) The method as defined in claim 13, wherein the required fee is adjusted to account for applicable discounts.

15. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 1, wherein the first healthcare provider is a physician~~, hospital, nursing home, or other treatment facility~~.

16.-18. (Cancelled)

19. (Currently Amended) An on-line information system for connecting healthcare providers with potential patients ~~providing verified information regarding healthcare providers~~, the system comprising:

at least one computer processor; and

memory coupled with and readable by the at least one computer processor and comprising a series of instructions that, when executed by the at least one computer processor, cause the at least one computer processor to:

receive a request for information regarding a first healthcare provider;

~~compile~~ access healthcare provider-verified information about the first healthcare provider, wherein the healthcare provider-verified information is received from the first healthcare provider and comprises three or more from the group consisting of: specialty information, medical philosophy, gender, age, years in profession, years in practice, awards, honors, professional appointments, professional memberships, publications, languages, and hobbies;

compile patient-provided information regarding the first healthcare provider, wherein the patient-provided information comprises patient ratings from one or more past or

current patients of the first healthcare provider, and wherein the patient ratings are received from an on-line patient experience survey completed on a company Web site by the one or more past or current patients of the first healthcare provider, and wherein the company Web site is managed by a company providing a service for connecting healthcare providers with the potential patients;

compile healthcare provider information regarding the first healthcare provider verified by an independent third-party source, wherein the information verified by the independent third-party source comprises three or more from the group consisting of: board certification, licensure, disciplinary action information, medical school, medical internship, medical residency, and medical fellowship information; [[and]]

create a healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider using the healthcare provider-verified information, the patient-provided information, and the information verified by the independent third-party source ~~independently verified information~~, wherein the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider includes comparison ratings of healthcare providers; and

provide access to the healthcare provider report on the first healthcare provider over a computer network.

20. (Currently Amended) The on-line information system defined in claim 19, wherein:

the healthcare provider report is obtained through one or more from the group consisting of: a predetermined Web page that provides search capabilities on its database [[or]] and a third-party search engine; and

the search capabilities of the predetermined Web page permit searching based on one or more from the group consisting of: name, medical specialty, gender, state, city, procedure, diagnosis, ~~procedure,~~ and location criteria.

21. (Currently Amended) The on-line information system defined in claim 20, wherein the at least one computer processor ~~further comprising~~:

produces ~~producing~~ a results list of one or more healthcare providers satisfying received search criteria, wherein the results list includes the first healthcare provider;

determines ~~determining~~ from the results list whether [[a]] the first ~~particular~~ healthcare provider is a member of [[a]] the company managing the Web site; and

if the first healthcare provider is a member of the company managing the Web site, provides ~~providing~~ enhanced services for the member healthcare provider on the Web site, wherein the enhanced services comprise making report information on the member healthcare provider available at no charge to the potential patients.