

Examiners' Comments on Candidates' Overall Performances in QE2013 Paper A

- Surprisingly, the vast majority of candidates did present a main claim that was not novel!

Several candidates only covered one embodiment in their main claim.

Vast majority of candidates presented a "meaningless" method claim, i.e. method of projecting water (or similar). Such a claim is infringed by the users, i.e. during showering which makes the claim commercially meaningless

None of the candidates offered at least some written description support for a method claim.

This paper is considered on the "easier side", therefore the overall performance is disappointing

- Too many candidates put unnecessary limitations.

Method claims are often directed to the end-user, which is in fact not unforeseeable.

No candidates come with a scheme in the description for a method.

The candidates need to pay more attention to Novelty.

- This year's passing rate seems higher than usual. This might however not be reflective of an overall better preparation or performance of the candidates but more caused by the paper itself. The main claim is easier to derive /draft than in previous years. In accordance with this interpretation none of the candidates drafted the requested method claims. This indicates that the candidates did not make sufficient legal considerations when writing the paper.
- All candidates did not do well in drafting a good method claim. Unsuccessful candidates includes unnecessary limitation(s) in the independent apparatus claim.