antibody put the skilled person in the position to obtain further antibodies with the same specificity. The board observed that similar questions had arisen in various cases decided by the boards of appeal, and different boards had given different answers depending on the circumstances of each case (**T 510/94**, **T 513/94**, **T 349/91**, **T 716/01**).

In **T 1466/05** the claim was not restricted to monoclonal antibodies defined by reference to the deposited hybridoma. As the application did not disclose any specific antigen for preparing further antibodies as claimed, the board considered that a skilled person seeking to prepare such antibodies would have had to embark on **a research programme** without any teaching in the application as how to achieve the desired specificity which amounted to an undue burden (cited in this respect by **T 760/12**).

Concerning the second medical use claims (claim 6 in the "Swiss-type" format, claim 7 in the purpose-restricted product claim format) in **T 760/12**, the technical effect, which was the therapeutic effect, was expressed in the claim. When the technical effect is expressed in the claim, the issue of whether this effect is indeed achieved over the whole scope of the claim is a question of sufficiency of disclosure (**G 1/03**, OJ 2004, 413, point 2.5.2 of the Reasons). Hence, under Art. 83 EPC, unless this is already known to the skilled person at the priority date, the application must disclose the suitability of the product to be manufactured for the claimed therapeutic application (**T 609/02**, point 9 of the Reasons). The board concluded that it was not sufficiently disclosed in the patent that a single monoclonal antibody as defined in the claim potentially exerted the therapeutic effect as claimed.

The claim at issue in **T 405/06** was directed to immunoglobulins with certain stated features. The question to be answered was whether a skilled person would have found at the filing date in the application as filed a sufficiently clear and complete disclosure of the precise structure of such an immunoglobulin in order to be in a position to prepare it over the broad range of the claim. Although the claim was not limited to immunoglobulins obtained from camelids, the experimental part of the description as a whole and the corresponding figures dealt exclusively with camel immunoglobulins and the general part of the description did not contain a complete disclosure of any non-camelid immunoglobulin either. The requirements of Art. 83 EPC 1973 were thus not satisfied, as the skilled person would be left with the task and burden of finding out how the teaching relating to camelid immunoglobulins could be extended to products of different origins (e.g. human immunoglobulins) falling within the broad area of the claim.

The application the subject of **T 433/07** concerned broadly reactive opsonic antibodies that react with common staphylococcal antigens. The board held that the invention was insufficiently disclosed; the application did not disclose either any serotype cross reactive monoclonal antibody or the isolation of an antigen associated with the serotype cross protective response required by the claim. A European patent application containing a claim referring to a method of production had to provide the skilled person with the means to produce the desired product. If this was not the case, this shortcoming could not be overcome by telling him exactly how the desired product had to look and which screening criteria had to be applied to find it.