

Examiners' Comments on Candidates' Overall Performances in QE2011 Paper A

General Comments

- Majority did not include method claim despite specific hints in paper.
- Many did not include refrigerator claim. This is important "back-up" claim.
- Many claimed "hinge mechanism" as main claim. Not any real incentive in paper to do so. Clear common sense issues with novelty, lack of prior art information on hinge in paper.
- Several included "handle" in main claim, despite clear indication of alternatives in paper.
- Some candidate broadened to include ovens, which is risky and totally unfounded from the paper/ nature of fridge and oven in context of inventive solution are not really the same, i.e. not even same problem exist really.
- Many candidates did not read the Paper and the instructions carefully and overlooked that method claims were to be drafted. Also too many candidates overlooked that the descriptions had to be brought into accordance with the claim words.
- Also, hardly any candidate considered the disclosure that the client gave orally during the meeting which was indicated as important in the paper.
- Quite a few candidates managed to claim a door structure as described in the paper, though many of the candidates had a claim that was either too restrictive or too broad, leading to lack of novelty. A large number of candidates did not have a claim to the method of retrofitting the door. Also, quite a few candidates did not claim the refrigerator having the door structure both omissions were quite surprising given the indicated use of the door structure in the paper.
- I had the impression that some candidates were under time pressure as they were brief with their description.

=====