discrepancy between the claims and the description was not a valid reason to ignore the clear linguistic structure of a claim and to interpret it differently (see e.g. **T 431/03** and **T 197/10**) or to give a different meaning to a claim feature which in itself imparts a clear credible technical teaching to the skilled reader (see e.g. **T 1018/02** and **T 1395/07**). See, however, also **T 195/20** (in which the board underlined that the skilled person would not stop at determining the semantic roles of words in a phrase).

c) Illogical and technically inaccurate claim features may not be disregarded

In **T 2002/13** the board referred to established case law, in particular **T 190/99** (see chapter II.E.2.3.3) according to which the claims must be read with a mind willing to understand and to make technical sense of them, thereby ruling out illogical or technically meaningless interpretations. The board recalled that the claims were directed to a person skilled in the art. However, the case law did not allow the reader to disregard an illogical or technically inaccurate feature of a claim and hence to interpret such a feature in a correct manner. Thus, if a claim included contradictory features, this contradiction could not be resolved by merely disregarding the technically inaccurate feature and considering only the convenient technically meaningful feature. All the less so when assessing the compliance of these two features with Art. 123(2) EPC. In the board's view, any other approach would provide an unwarranted advantage to the patentee/appellant. See also the abstract of **T 81/13** in chapter II.E.1.4.7 "Elimination of inconsistencies and unclear features".

d) Ambiguous features – role of description and drawings

In **T 23/02** the board said that although the claims as originally filed contained no reference to a **method of measurement** for the average particle diameter, that did not mean that any method could be used to determine that parameter. If anything, the claims raised doubts as to how the average particle diameter had to be determined, in particular because the skilled person would be aware that the measuring method is decisive in particle size analysis. Therefore the skilled person would use the description and drawings when deciding how the average particle diameter was to be measured. They would then conclude that, when properly interpreted in light of the original description, the claims as originally filed contained restrictions as to the measuring method for the average particle diameter. For the case law on the need to include the measuring method of a parameter in the claim, see however chapter II.C.6.6.9 "Analytical measuring methods".

In **T 1946/10** the board held that according to established jurisprudence the skilled person interprets a claim with a mind willing to understand, so as to arrive at an interpretation which is technically sensible and takes into account the whole disclosure of the patent. Though he strives in principle to understand a claim within the wording and terms of the claim itself, he may, where he encounters ambiguities, need to consult the description and drawings to gain a better understanding. Based on the understanding of the added feature gained by this claim interpretation, the board arrived at the conclusion that adding the feature to claim 1 as originally filed in isolation from its structural and functional context presented a new teaching not originally disclosed. In the same vein, see **T 2350/15** with reference to **T 1592/14**.