In **T 560/09** the board emphasised with regard to technical features expressed in general functional terms that the function must be able to be verified by tests or procedures adequately specified in the description or known to the skilled person. That meant not only that a feature in the claim must be comprehensible, but also non-ambiguous in that it could be determined without any ambiguity whether the claimed functional requirement was satisfied (see **T 2427/13**). Hence, means of distinction were mandatory in order to allow a definition by a function instead of by a structure in a claim.

In **T 243/91** it was stated that a functional feature was allowable if that feature provided a clear instruction to a skilled person to reduce it to practice without undue burden. In **T 893/90** the feature "being present in amounts and proportions just sufficient to arrest bleeding" was held to be a functional feature which defined a technical result which also constituted a testable criterion to be satisfied by the claimed pharmaceutical composition. Because such testing involved only routine trials, the adopted functional language was allowable. The introduction of a reference to specific amounts and/or proportions of the components would limit the claim and was not necessary. The situation in **T 893/90** was distinguished from the one before the board in **T 181/96**. Although in the former case the testing might appear prima facie bothersome, it was nothing out of the ordinary for the field of medicine, involving only routine trials. In the case in hand, however, which concerned an apparatus for hydrostatically testing a sealing element of a threaded connection between two connected sections of pipe, there was no general type of pipe connections with generally well-defined ranges of dimensions which were thus generally available for verification of the functional features as such. In **T 1802/12** the board stated that the description did not contain any test to verify whether the functional features were present after having applied the claimed method. The board concluded that – contrary to the situation in **T 893/90**, where a test was available – the requirements of Art. 84 EPC were not met.

In **T 391/91** claim 1 set out in general terms the sequence of steps to be followed in order to put the invention into practice, i.e. in order to produce unicellular micro-organism host cells having INA (ice nucleation activity) or enhanced INA. The claim was in fact a generalisation from the particular examples. The board stated that as there was no reason to doubt that it was possible to generalise the specific teaching of the examples given, it would be unfair to the appellant to require a restriction of the claim by incorporation therein of the specific features of the examples. The skilled person could use any suitable variant capable of providing the same effect of the invention. This might be tedious, but it was nothing out of the ordinary in this field and involved only routine trials. The claim was thus allowable under Art. 84 EPC 1973.

In **T 241/95** (OJ 2001, 103) the Swiss-type second medical use claim defined the disease or disorder to be treated with substance X as "condition which is capable of being improved or prevented by selective occupation of the serotonin receptor". The board held that this functional definition was unclear because no test was at hand to determine whether the therapeutic effects were a result of the newly discovered property of X of occupying the serotonin receptor or any other known or unknown property of that substance. See also **T 2321/13**.