with an upper limit, and a preferred disclosed narrower range – equally consisting of a lower limit which is unequivocally combined with an upper limit – were simply missing. Even a kind of parallel structure in indicating the upper and lower limits (less/at least, preferred or more preferred) implied **no unequivocal correlation between a particular upper limit and a particular lower limit** because there was no teaching that such an arrangement was intended. Therefore, one of the upper limits mentioned in the first sentence in the description of the parent application as originally filed (as cited above) and one of the lower limits mentioned in the second sentence were arbitrarily combined, which did not represent a direct and unambiguous disclosure.

d) Combination of an end point of a range with a value from a list of individually disclosed values

In **T 1320/13** claim 1 defined a specific ratio in the range of "between 0.6 and 1". The appellant argued that the range had a basis in the disclosure of the range "0.1 and about 1" in claim 5 in conjunction with the value "0.6" disclosed in a **list of individual values**, which read: "about 1.0, 0.9, 0.8, 0.7, 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1 or even 0, derivable therein". The board held that **T 2/81** did not apply in the case at issue. The skilled person would not regard the list of individually disclosed values of ratios on page 5 of the application as individual end points of ranges. Firstly, a list of individual values – even if disclosed as here in descending order – did not relate to values that lie between them, while a range necessarily encompasses all the values that lie between its two disclosed end points, i.e. a list of individual values is conceptually different from a range. Secondly, the list contained no pointers to a particular combination of ratio values. Accordingly, a specific selection of values also did not clearly and unambiguously emerge for the skilled person from the content of the application.

e) Combination of end points of different levels of preference for several aspects of a composition

In **T 948/13** the subject-matter of claim 1 of auxiliary request 3 had been generated by combining a number of numerical ranges of different levels of preference (general range, most preferred range) for various aspects of the composition. The board held that the selection of these ranges in combination was neither disclosed as such nor otherwise suggested in the application as originally filed.

For a further case in which each of the added features (including ranges of parameters) were, in the board's view, disclosed in the application as filed, though not in combination, see e.g. **T 1853/13** (with regard to claim 1 of auxiliary request 2).

In **T 2514/16**, the board considered it allowable to combine thresholds from different levels of preference (see the summary in chapter II.E.1.5.1a) above). It also found that combining this limitation with a second amendment (limiting the amount of metal cation with end points in line with the most preferred embodiment) was directly and unambiguously derivable from the original application. It noted that the two amendments amounted to a limitation of a feature that had already been present in original claim 2, with both features