Examiners' Comments on Candidates' Overall Performances in QE2012 Paper B

- A number of not-novel claim 1
- Too few offered novel single claim 1 for 1st + 2nd embodiment
- Most candidates spotted to drop 3rd embodiment correctly (if not all)
- Most candidates spotted single nozzle feature required (if not all)
- Generally structure of responses OK
- Often, client letter poor & also time management issue wisely
- Noteworthy: Some US-style based problems regarding added matter and multiple independent claims with non-unity
- Candidates often unnecessarily lose points by not addressing all the issues of the client's in instructions. The letter should be read carefully and all the points should be addressed.
- Most of the candidates spotted the "one nozzle" common feature. The "separation at least in the main body" – feature was less well spotted.
- Some candidates failed to write a novel claim over AAPA when the pouch is ruptured.
- The basis for amendments should be done as precise as possible, especially if a feature is removed. Avoid generalisation of a feature.
- Most of the novelty and inventive step argumentations were complete, but some too vague and too general. Be precise and complete.
- Some candidates lost points for drafting non-unitary claims. This was not necessary and filing divisional leads to additional costs – therefore not considered the best way of claiming.