

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

- Generally, candidates have been able to identify features to distinguish the invention, address the unity issue and recognise the added subject matter issue.

Inventive step reasoning varies among candidates and most could have been more detailed and specific, rather than general statements. Some candidates could have provided appropriate dependent claims, alternative amendments in the letter to client.

- Most of the candidates had construed a new set of claims that made sense. Some candidates introduced a feature that was not disclosed as such, or introduced an unclear feature. Most candidates used the lip for collecting and deflecting the grease, some added the fact that the ventilator comprises a plurality of blades. This was considered to be more restrictive.

The introduction “each blade comprises a lip” was not considered disclosed. Those candidates that had “the ridge located on the bottom wall and circumferentially surrounding the centre opening, the ridge defining a trough with the side walls, which is adapted to retain water at the bottom of the pan” could have passed as well, but some the candidates only claimed the ridge without the feature “adapted to retain water”. Then it was quite challenging to set up a convincing novelty and inventive step argumentation.

The question of Ni-Cr alloy with molybdenum was spotted by all to be undisclosed, however some made the mistake to say that priority from this application will also count for a new alloy application. One candidate wrote to keep the material secret until an application is filed, which was found to be a good advise to BBQ-Ben.

The non-unity issue was dealt with by most candidates in an appropriate manner in the response and the amendments, however the letter to BBQ-Ben of a significant amount of candidates contained some less good advises on this issue.