determine or correct parameters either not or inaccurately referred to in the patent specification was thus irrelevant in establishing whether the conditions of Art. 83 EPC were met (the board refused to order an independent expert opinion). The board also refused a request for referral of a question to the Enlarged Board, reiterating on this occasion what was meant by "skilled person" (point 9 of the Reasons).

T 1861/11 concerned an invention relating to user interfaces. The appellant (applicant) chose to disclose the invention by means of a conceptual metaphor, a so-called "3D motion user interface", and the relevant disclosure was very brief. In the circumstances of the case, the board decided that details that the skilled person would need were not disclosed (Art. 83 EPC not satisfied). Moreover, as a matter of principle, a deficiency in disclosure concerning the conceptual fundamentals of the invention could not be remedied without violating the restrictions codified in Art. 123(2) EPC.

Patent specifications cannot normally contribute to the sufficiency of the disclosure unless they are available to the skilled reader of the patent in question (**T 171/84**, OJ 1986, 95). By way of exception, however, patent specifications and scientific publications may be considered to form part of the common general knowledge where the invention is in a field of research so new that the relevant technical knowledge is not yet available from textbooks (**T 51/87**, OJ 1991, 177; see also **T 772/89**, **T 676/94**, **T 1900/08**, **T 2196/15**). In **T 676/94** the board considered that the question whether or not the contents of a technical periodical formed part of the average knowledge of a skilled person when assessing sufficiency of disclosure, should be answered on the basis of the facts and evidence in each particular case.

References to DVB standards were found insufficient to meet the standards of Art. 83 EPC in **T 1191/04**. In **T 417/13** the size of the PVC particles was an important feature. The particle size may vary to a large extent depending on the method of measurement. The description of the application provided only very limited information. The person skilled in the art had thus to rely on his common general knowledge for the selection of an appropriate method of measurement. The board concluded that in the present case of PVC particles the skilled person would not have considered using any method of measurement, but would have chosen a method relying on sieving, such as a method according to ISO standard 1624. It was also decided that in this case the physical and mathematical facts about particle size measurements were notorious.

In **T 1608/13** the board noted that a patent document is directed to the skilled person, who interprets it in the light of the common general knowledge in the technical field concerned. Consequently, it is not necessary for all the details of the invention to be specifically described in order for a disclosure to be sufficient. In the present case, in the absence of a description in the patent of a specific measuring method for determining the sieving coefficient of a membrane for the separation of toxic mediators from blood by haemofiltration, the skilled person would first look for applicable standards in the field, if present. Whether other methods for carrying out the measurements were available was not decisive as long as there was no evidence that the results in the specific field of the invention would be contradictory depending on the chosen method. The respondent (opponent) did not provide any such evidence.