

Examiners' Comments on Candidates' Overall Performances in QE2014 Paper B

- I personally feel that the Examination Question for Paper B was well set and that it should not have much difficulties to pass the exam for candidates who have 3-4 years working experience.
- Overall, all the candidates have sufficient knowledge in responding to rejection with respect to novelty and inventive step issue. But to present a convincing argument, more efforts has to be put in. I believe most of the candidates know how to respond to the rejection mentioned in the Written Opinion but the way they presented or the way they argue is less "convincing". Merely mentioning the unique features of the claimed invention is insufficient, but differences between the claimed invention and the cited art need to be clearly shown, and the resultant of the differences need to be addressed.
- As for reporting letter to client, a number of candidates do not well address the issues (i) based on client's instructions, and (ii) that have been done in the response in order to overcome the rejection. Therefore, mark on this section is generally low.
- As for claim amendment, candidates should have knowledge to incorporate an allowable dependent claim to a main claim, but I do not see candidates making mistake.
- Very few candidates have provided dependent claims for fall back use.
- Overall, most of the candidate can get score above 40, but none of passed candidates obtain more than 60 marks.
- As might be expected, it is difficult to determine the exact level of candidates for Paper B. However, I do believe those candidates have more years of practical experience in drafting patent specification and responding to Written Opinion would be able to score higher marks in the exam.
- Summing up, IPOS has done a very good job to do the best to ensure candidate be given sufficient time to complete Paper B in 4 hours.