Question1	Question2FreeText
Negative	... but as new versions are coming, the software improves a LOT!
Negative	5000 functions - poor help in special cases, Viewer badly integrated,(no mark passages transfer - requested and promised since 12 years), worklist names are useless (numbers)editing should be an option , searching a special Ross for import impossible by date (who remembers a number?) to say a few
Negative	A lot of klicking, not very stable, unnecessary printing
Negative	Accelerator keys are changed with new releases for example, making it necessary to relearn new shortcuts each time.
Negative	All the layout of the user interface seems to be designed to go against the user intuition . You never now how Cut/Copy-Paste will work in a certain input area(key shortcut? or main menu selection or contextual menu). Why does the spelling check works only in certain text areas and not in others? The interface for inputting data related to citations is dreadful. The training should not focus in what is possible (like it is now) but in how the program should be used in an efficient way in practice, i.e. which one of the alternatives are advised.
Negative	Although some aspects can be seen as improvements, many are not and ergonomically, it is a disaster. Overall, I would prefer to have CASEX/CAESAR back.
Negative	Although some improvements were introduced, other useful features were taken away. As a result, we actually loose just as much time as with the many bugs of casex. Also, certain bugs occur after sending a communication. This requires extra work for the FOSA, thus costing also more time. A more elaborate survey, allowing us to express our opinion on specific aspects of Trimaran, would be very useful.
Negative	another tool launched too early, still too many bugs, too complicated, not onvious to the user what to do next or on what 'level' one is; maybe in two years ...
Negative	another user unfriendly and unflexible application developped by the office...
Negative	As WUC I have been a Trimaran user for quite some time. I stopped taking part in the official satisfaction surveys early on, as their results were evidently manipulated to provide an artificially positive impression.
Negative	Bad - software badly designed and implemented - too many bugs/workarounds even 6 month after rollout. - horrible ergonimics - user UN- friendly - Martha/spellchecker - missing functionality, - unflexible handling of Appl. Docs (partially) good + stability + availability of scanned/OCRed application documents + availability of text-compare function (though badly implemented) I personally wonder how a software which was years (3-4 years?) late, cost millions of Euros was delivered in a worse-than-alpha-relase quality to 4000+ examiners as the most important tool to work with. Are we all unpaid testing staff of our IT-department?
Negative	Bad ergonomics (input of Documents cited and input of passages), the objective to have the CT-phase within the dossier (like the paper-version) is not achieved; too many buttons and special functions in the editor
Negative	basically no change from previous applications. Had the extraordinary amount of money, man-power and resources used differently, we could have built a replacement for the tower, given thousands of euros as bonus to staff, etc
Negative	biggest issue is ergonomices especially citations, sources, document categories
Negative	Boot time is too long, overall responsiveness is sluggish: this may also depend on a slow data connection, but recent email exchange with the support team has pointed out that implementation choices have/had an important influence on execution speed. Redundant information is displayed (tabs and sidebar), wasting space: the 'To Do List' is welcome, but also a clear indicator of how poor the overview of the workflow is. As a side effect, too much space is wasted by titles, toolbars, panel titles, panel tabs, panel toolbars, status bar, leaving very little space for information display and entry. With respect to CAESAR/CASEX transferring documents was made easier, but the interface requires many more clicks and some automation in the classes section could save a lot of repeated data entry (e.g. importing scope of search from the RoSS automatically).

Negative	Change is not good per se, whatever 'modern' managers believe, it is only good if it improves something. I did not notice major improvements in my work, but I do suffer major inconvenience due to heavy disturbance of my daily routine. Not to mention the several hundreds bugs available in Trimaran.
Negative	Citing doc. is a mess (caesar was much more user friendly). For certain Auxiliary requests it is difficult to enter the data
Negative	clumsy editor and general workability anoy my and cost a lot of time
Negative	Concerning the main window: Examiners have to toggle between a multitude of windows/fields in which the information is hidden, and to enlarge and minimize windows all the time. A WYSIWYG format in the form of the final search report and annexes would be much better. The obligation to choose between X-I an X-N is disturbing and looses time. Normally, an examiner compares the closest prior art to all claims, but not further documents. It would take an enormous time to do so and is not useful. The result is that one gives arbitrarily X-I and X-N labels. The field 'source' looses time to fill-in and has no use now that much more precise information is available through ROSS. It is my experience with collegues that nobody attempts to fill-in the 'source' field with true source information. Concerning Martha: It has the advantage that nearly all button are available without going through menus and sub-menus. The indent and list relating buttons are however ill conceived. The effect of one button is hardly predictable. It depends from a state at a given point of the text, in function of which indent and list buttons were
Negative	Considering the almost perfect 'non-intuitive lay-out' of Trimaran the production of search reports and letters takes significantly more time than before (I'm not a heavy user due to other activities). And I don't like at all the constrainst on 'active dossiers', 'working lists' (viewer) and ROSS, which go completely against my natural way of working.
Negative	does not connect to previous search report when SR was not established under trimaran - 'Internal' not included in trimaran - application docs: 'single request' should be made default - PCT: nomenclature of trimaran should be brought in line with do
Negative	Editor is far away from being finished. Ergonomics could be improved. Stability is ok. The whole system is very slow.
Negative	Einige Beispiele: Für Standardfunktionen (z.B. Erstellen eines Recherchenberichtes) sind signifikant mehr Mausklicks erforderlich als zuvor - warum eigentlich? Das Eingeben von Textstellen unter 'Citations' (siehe dort das + Symbol am rechten Rand der Eingabemaske) ist eine Zumutung, da das + Symbol viel zu klein ist, ungünstig positioniert, und zudem erfolgt oft erst nach wiederholtem Anklicken eine Reaktion. Das Textverarbeitungsprogramm zum Bescheideschreiben ist nicht ausgereift; es werden vom System beispielsweise willkürlich Leerzeilen und Leerzeichen eingefügt. Die Kursorpositionierung ist ungenau. Und das sind nur einige Beispiele. Der einzige Vorteil, den ich bislang sehe, ist, dass das System offenbar etwas stabiler läuft.
Negative	ergonomic disaster ridiculously designed slows me down it actually HURTS to use this software!!!
Negative	Ergonomically, it seems perverse to issue a version of Martha with buttons for, for example inserting standard clauses and/or claims, letting people get used to these buttons and then removing them in an up-dated version. In WordPerfect, the user could define buttons - not so, apparently, in Martha.
Negative	ergonomics are worse than in casex and caesar. obviously written by someone who does not examine. citation manager in trimaran is awful - requires extensive use of the mouse to open the catagories, passages, etc. alt-tabbing in the passages misses out columns and paragraphs, can't cut and past into the 'special abstract' entry, etc, etc, etc..... still VERY beta.
Negative	Ergonomics is a catastrophe, compatibility with Dragon as well
Negative	Ergonomy is a catastrophy. More and more mouse input actions required. Illogical distibution of features. Poor customisation options
Negative	Establishing a search report is a nightmare!
Negative	even more clicking needed than before - very bad for people with RSI problems, as compatibilty with Dragon is so poor as to slow down the processes so much that one simply has to revert to mouse use to get anythign done in time.

Negative	even the latest version has a lot of bugs - elementary features of a word processing software are still missing (e.g. tabulators)in Martha. - citations are complicated to access
Negative	Excessive number of mouse clicks necessary for each action - the latest change has removed the button for claims from the taskbar - this was probably the most frequently used button, and now requires additional....I think you get the picture; paragraph numbering over-complex; standard clause window disappears and has to be continually recalled; annotations to form 2035.3 is positively byzantian - pure genius must have been employed to bring in such a level of complexity. How is it that while the general trend is to reduce the the amount of mouse-related tasks to a minimum in order to avoid RSI problems, for Trimaran the reverse appears to be the case?
Negative	far too many bugs, too many clicks, not intuitive.
Negative	Filling in the data / crossing checkboxes is cumbersome since the GUI of Trimaran is neither logical nor ergonomic. Much more mouse action is needed, in particular when filling in the 'cited documents'. A lot of unneccessary scrolling back and forth, re-setting of frames/borders within the window. The Editor has nice features, but is designed in an unergonomic way. Recent changes even worse the situation (pull-down menu for accessing for example Standard Clauses instead of icon before; no customisation of the menu possible, thus the layout cannot be re-set)
Negative	generally too much clicking and an awfull editor (ie the Martha thing sucks)
Negative	Gerade unter RSI-Aspekten ist Trimaran grauenvoll! Zu viele Mausklicks nötig, zu viel kleine Schrift auf dem Bildschirm.
Negative	getting slower and slower after every new version
Negative	Hardly better than the two separated tools we had before, since it requires at least as many swapping of windows and does not have a better response time.Comparator would be good if text available which is almost never the case.
Negative	I do not agree with the generally positive articles from the propaganda department. The system is not stable. The computer is incredibly slow when working with Trimaran (e.g. start, opening a dossier). Compatibility with CASEX/CAESAR is low so that it is cumbersome to include information from previous files. The Martha-editor is catastrophic. Its standard is below the stone-age version of Wordperfect we had before.
Negative	I feel a substantial deterioration of the work when being forced to use trimaran. There are too many data displayed at the same time leading to the situation that the eye is overwhelmed with information (buttons, captions, headlines, unnecessary thins etc.). Furthermore, there are no improvements versus the old system, since the original separation of SR and exam action was absolutely fine. Nowadays, every time an e.g. WO-ISA is corrected, a new SR is printed at the same time. What a waste of paper! Furthermore, if you forget to add the newly (and unnecessarily) printed SR to the file, it will come back for not containing the moste recent version of the SR. In addition, the clicking throught the particular cited documents (for adding dosys, cited pages etc.) has become a nightmare, since you always have to scroll etc. VERY INCONVENIENT. My request is to abolsih Trimraran and to re-introduce the old system, possibly with some minor improvements.
Negative	I hate the fact that the Marta communication window closes when I go to anohter area of Trimaran (e.g. add a class; check the citations of a document...). I hate the fact that I cannot directly retrieve a standart close directly ad before (I now have to go first to a subsection, e.g. 'novelty' and then choose my standart clause). In a grant the 'submission' section (page Numbers etc) has not been simplified. etc. The only positive point in the 'Citation in the Viewer'.
Negative	I have the impression that with each version of trimaran new 'features' have been implemented which makes our work even harder. After one year of using Trimaran I am still slower than when using CAESAR/CASEX with WordPerfect.

Negative	I never asked to be a test person a with all the bugs this program has, it is the impression I get. The training I had 18 month ago does not correspond to the tool we have now. Ergonomics is a catastrophy
Negative	I never wasted so much time on any other application (bugs, rigidity, user unfriendliness, no WYSIWYG...). The worst has been errors in the coherence of search report doc numbers (contrary to Caesar, the BNS availability check had been removed!) which went undiscovered until the formalities offficer tried to send them. The recovery from such errors, when at all possible, was always very lengthy and problematic. My productivity is currently at an all time low partly because of that.
Negative	I think Trimaran was a missed opportunity. In particular I don't think that that interface was very well optimised to the way we work (ergonomics). The poor interface is a very big let down. The rest - the idea of linking search and examination and having and integrated text editor is fine.
Negative	I was happy with last version of Trimaran until the latest change which arrived in mid September which has introduced a mass of unncecessary complications and changes. So I now give a negative which was very positive one week ago.
Negative	improve ergonomics. overloaded screen, useless information. making search report is a mess (so many mouse clicks) compared to caesar. slow response of the software. usesess spell checker, no auto-correction of typing errors in martha.
Negative	In Ihrer unendlichen Weisheit haben die Trimaran Entwickler in dem neuesten Release sich dafür entschieden die Shortscuts z.B. für die Standart Cls. unter einen neuen Menüpunkt 'Insert Text' zusammenzufassen. Ich wünsch den Entwickler weiterhin dass sie genügend Zeit zum Ansetzen bekommen, damit sie nicht mit Ihrem Trimaran Recherchieren und Prüfen müssen und so auch nicht Gefahr laufen, aufgrund von unnötigen 'Zusatz-Klicks' mal an einer Sehnenscheidenentzündung zu erkranken!
Negative	inerface with viewer can be a mess, word processor is almost primitive.
Negative	it indroduces more clicks with each update, and you can not find anymore what you have figured out already (which did cost a lot of time)
Negative	It is an integrated tool with some improved functions versus CASEX AND CEASAR, however, unfortunately the drawbacks in user friendliness, ergonomics, complexity and rigidity of the tool outweigh significantly the improvements.
Negative	It is impossible to control it with the keyboard only.
Negative	It is not significantly better than what we had before, although some items are. Some items are much worse. But taking into account the effort to learn it, the change to Trimaran was definitely not worth.
Negative	It is slow and complicated und not ergonomical, i.e. it needs a lot of mouseclicks.
Negative	It is worse than what we had before. It calls the competence of the people who provided it into question. I have stopped asking questions to which I get no answer, I simply do the best I can with it.
Negative	It seems that recently modifications have been made, that have made the user interface even worse, without taking into account the wishes of the users (ie in the editor the two clicks now needed to access regularly used buttons such as standard clauses and cited documents, but creating a clause, which is more rarely used has remained as 1-click)
Negative	It's like washing up in boxing gloves.
Negative	Learning a lot of changes only to find, that functionality has been reduced. We have been promissed a proper grammtical check for years - now we have none at all ! Appalling !
Negative	Like often at the EPO: Much Ado About Nothing... The main problems are, according to me: constant changes without advising us, too many cliks necessary too expand each items, and therefore much more back pain and arm problems...
Negative	Lots of unnecessary gimmicks, - the things which I wanted to have implemented (strike thorough in Non unity reasonings accompanying the Invitation; reported that to helpdesk in 2006!!!) still not possible - very slow when working from home (PTHW) -

Negative	Main problems: - Martha editor way too limited. Editors for SSA Incomplete Search or NU in CAESAR will not even allow subscripts or superscripts! they are useless for writing technical notations - too few keyboard shortcuts and too many mouse actions
Negative	Many buttons etc. are very slow to respond to mouse clicks cf. other applications. The functionality of adding comments to the Application Documents for grant is simply awful. That the footnotes have to be entered manually, and the comments are completely lost upon 'regeneration' of the documents is an abomination. Also, why oh why oh why oh why was it not considered to implement in Martha the possibility to select multiple discrete entities and apply the same formatting to them all at once (e.g. bold, underline, superscript, subscript etc.) - I HAVE TO SPEND SO MUCH UNNECESSARY TIME SELECTING THEM ONE AT A TIME.
Negative	Martha ist eine Zumutung
Negative	more stable but very slow (e. g. menues opening takes ages) and less functionalities (in particular Martha lacks a lot of things that Word provided)
Negative	Most of my problems with Trimaran stem from the editor, which lacks even the basic features of a proper text editor and is a massive step backwards from even the obsolete WordPerfect we used to use.
Negative	My opinion about the functions of Trimaran is positive. But with regard to stability and response time, there are serious problems with Trimaran: The program takes about 10 min. each morning to start up. Quite regularly, the program 'freezes' and then SEA or the whole computer has to be restarted.
Negative	Negative because of stone-age wordprocessor and need for far too many superfluous mouse-clicks (e.g. when filling in passages of a doc)
Negative	negative: More clicks / keyboard ticks than before to do the same actions. Very slow interface (due to Java?) and huge memory consumption. positive: Editor is better than WordPerfect that used to crash upon exit. The possibility to import the claim in the text reduces the typing effort. The text comparator in Trimaran accelerates the comparison between amendments.
Negative	no improvement with respect to previous system text editor inacceptable with respect to functionality and readability of the printouts ergonomically insufficient
Negative	None of the points you list as example criteria are fullfilled by the current version: It's unstable, slow, inconsistent, ... to be continued. The basic principle is good, but: Why JAVA on Windows (instead of Linux), which is known to be extremely buggy and slow? If it shall be Windows, then why not use a 'professional' programming environment? Why an editor which apparently does not work consistently? Why do i have to click two-times on the same in order to get a response?
Negative	not a good idea to have everything integrated; such software should be easy to use according to what we have to do and simple, not with two many checks which sometime make impossible perform our tasks; we are not stupid, therefore, we don't need a super intelligent software
Negative	Not at all complying with MINIMUM ergonomic, response-time and user-friendliness requirements. Working with this tool full-time over many years may cause serious health injuries.
Negative	Not ergonomic, too much clicking, not logical arrangement of windows, printing of actions unfriendly, the editor is not clever, very slow responses
Negative	Not intuitive. APPLICATION DOCUMENTS: Not intuitive. OVERVIEW for Citations: you have to click too many times to enter COMMENTS, etc..
Negative	Not too stable, as soon as my java.exe reaches 700MB (what for ?) the editor becomes very slow and everything is a pain, so I usually have to start and stop SEA at least once a day. Also encountered several problems between me 'send & print' a file and my FO never receiving it properly. Ergonomics got a bit weirder with this new button 'Insert Text' it was much easier before and it's not like the button bar is too small on my screen more than half of it is unused and could provide a direct access to these features.
Negative	not user friendly, martha is worse than WP (except that there are less blockings). Many tabs put in a messy way.

Negative	Not user friendly, not fool proof, fuzzy lay-out, multiple access for same item, bad overview of work and many other drawbacks. Few improvements on specific item, therefore not very negative.
Negative	Over-sophistication with less important add-ons, user-unfriendly in particular with respect to composing 'application documents' and overcharged screen diminishes clarity of overview.
Negative	Overview of search report impossible. Aukward ergonomics.
Negative	Particularly the interface is not user-friendly and thus stressy. It is overloaded with frames you rarely need for S&E, such as the non-editable 'Bibliographic Data' frame; weird tree structures; same names for different windows/frames which is confusing and annoying, such as 'Classes/Titles' in the 'Overview' and in 'Search Report'; hidden 'right-mouse button' features which even the WUC did not know, such as the function 'Legal Numbering Properties' in the text editor to overcome the hitherto non-editable, ugly 'legal numbering' of paragraphs with numbers without dot; the unprofessional text editor with a rather unsuitable, non-intelligent spell checker and limited number of special characters; bad frame, color, and icon management which makes it stressy to find the right buttons at once. The 'Viewer' is still the old-fashioned software. You cannot edit the greyish background of the color markers (unless you switch the harrdware screen mode to agressive 'strawberry colors'), so only a few colors are clearly distinguishable and identifiable without stress.
Negative	Personally speaking, I am not able to do better nor faster search and examination before because of a different form filling program: no real improvement over the sum of previously available tools exists, because search and examination remained the same. A clear improvement is in the standard clause editor. The new one is much better than the old, and my best guess is that, in a 30+ years career, it may spare the examiner a total of 10, maybe even 15, hours compared to writing and using the standard clauses with the old one. Overall, in my opinion, trimaran looks like a waste of time and resources. My recommendation is to keep trimaran and do incremental improvements only when actively requested by a significant number of the users, and under an extremely limited time and money budget, because another new tool doing the same things of trimaran, or of the old combination of casex+cesar+dossier would look like a new waste of time and resources.
Negative	response time between different windows. user friendliness, too many windows, buttons, check ...
Negative	response time too long
Negative	response time too long, problems with starting from dossier list, bloccking,
Negative	Response time: very slow, especially when calling Standard Clauses with Martha, but not only; - often stability problems with Martha; - ergonomics: very bad, especially 'prio art', 'citations'; Sources in 'Classes/titles'; - ofen, all the bibliograph
Negative	search report software : NOT user friendly. Communications writing : slighly better.
Negative	software is not developped for the interest of the examiner, some change are done without to ask what would be the impact negative or positive incredibable
Negative	Speed needs to be improved a lot, and all these bugs elimininated...
Negative	stardard clause button disappeared, this button is used many times but now I have to click twice to get it, while the button to create a standard clause which is rarely used is there. Very strange decision.
Negative	Starting Trimaran after a shut-down takes much too long.
Negative	Still lacks ergonomy and, worse, brain!
Negative	still way too many problems and errors for a program that has to be used in production; stability: so so; user friendliness: worse that casex/caesar; response time: incredibly slow; ergonomics: the worst program that I have to use; customisation: substantially missing; accelerator keys: often don't work.

Negative	Tant d'attente et d'argent gaspillé pour çà.... - Nouveau editeur de texte qui donne l'impression d'avoir toujours 10 années de retard.. - Un logiciel qui vous fait réimprimer tout votre rapport de recherche à chaque fois que vous faite la moindre modification.. (L'EPO modèle pour l'écologie ???) - une visibilité encore + réduite par rapport à l'ancien système pour ce qui est du formulaire concernant les citations !
Negative	Text editor often has irritating typing delays, pages to be filled in are difficult to find (confusing, counter-intuitive structure).
Negative	the citation panel is really awful messy; overall, again one has to use the mouse more and more; RSI danger...
Negative	The combination of systems which trimaran replaced were, in their combination, rubbish. However, trimaran is not really very good. In particular it is not very intuitive.
Negative	the editor is a nightmare. The user interface unfriendly
Negative	The good ideas in Trimaran (all-in-one software, text editor which recognizes mouse scrolls (!), consistency checks between inputs) are undermined by the unprofessionalism of the way Trimaran has been implemented (slow; previous capabilities that are now missing, such as equation editor, symbols as a font not a special character, 11 pt font, etc...; updates that make Trimaran lose more features and require two clicks instead of one for inserting documents and clauses, as well as for inputs in citations).
Negative	The large number of options on screen at any one time has rendered keyboard shortcuts virtually unusable. Thus the user is almost completely dependent on the mouse. In some cases, shortcut 'numbers' change depending on how much is open on the screen; in any case numbers can go into three digits, making learning shortcuts difficult, especially since they keep changing!
Negative	The Martha WP software is a DISASTER when it comes to FORMATTING the text with ease AND beeing able to see/track the changes easily as in WordPerfect or Microsoft Word !!! Due to formatting problems and a lot of my colleagues have already wasted far too much time during word processing wit Martha. Martha is a heavily scaled down AND flawed WP software which was NOT developed with having the examiners in mind and writing the text in Microsoft Word and copying into Martha also does NOT help because Martha messes up ALL the formatting. Overall Martha is a VERY disappointing WP software which COMPLETELY ruins the otherwise positive aspects of Trimaran !!! The Office was definitely saving money at the wrong end of the Trimaran package with having regard to the lousy WP software Martha !!!
Negative	The need of numerous mouse clicks is a problem for people with RSI. Moreover, it is not compatible with vocal system like DNS.
Negative	the new version needs more clicking, because to insert application documents or claims etc nor button is anymore directly provided
Negative	The newer versions are worse in ergonomics than the older one. It is simply very bad programmed. I am in the meanwhile very tired phoning HelpDesk - which is only collecting the bad news, but does not have any influence in changing it - about the flaws, deficiencies and programming errors of Trimaran.
Negative	the number of mouse clicks to do a certain function has increased enormously; the ergonomic aspects have been totally ignored (as always in the EPO); some clicking field are so small that they are very difficult to see
Negative	The poor user friendliness and ergonomics are by far not compensated by the very minor enhancements of the possibilities.
Negative	The text editor MARTHA is like something out of the nineties! Even SMART was better than this.
Negative	the text formatting is not efficient enough for me
Negative	The user interface for entering all data needed to fill out a search report is horrible and worse than the GUI whe had in caesar. Useless columns containing even more useless icons fill up the screen while important text fields are not big enough. Using a wysiwyg style for entering the report would be straightforward. But what we have makes things more complicated.
Negative	The worst aspect is the text editor: I lose so much time to check the language in another text editor !

Negative	There are improvements with respect to the old Caesar/Casex system, for example the automatic filling in of searched claims in the WOISA in case of lack of unity, but all these improvements could have been easily inserted into the old Caesar/Casex system. The new Trimaran user interface is at best not better than the old Caesar/Casex user interface, it is only confusing in a different way. In any event any new user interface, which is no improvement, is a deterioration, since it costs a lot of time to get acquinted with the new user interface.
Negative	there are still so many illogical things and the editor is much worse than word-perfect, application docs must always be 'regenerated', was better in casex, the fillling out of the search report is extremely cumbersome with all the different windows etc, the places where to find e.g. classification, title , prior art is not logical, insertion of standard clauses has become more cumbersome, the 'legal numbering' is much worse than old F7,
Negative	To much mouse clicks are necessary, in particular to cite a document in the search report. Unbelievable such a bad systeme, knowing the massiv RSI problems the EPO is already facing !
Negative	Too many clicks because of inconsistent shortcuts (e.g. cancel is ctrl+C, ctrl+66 etc.) one ends up using the mouse. Too many sub-menues. Slow and spams the RAM. Marta does not recognise the standard short-cuts like for the ß (Alt+225) etc. Marta is extremely slow taking into account that is is only an (extended) text editor.
Negative	Too many clicks necessary (compared to CAESAR), for instance, if you have entered a document and you awant to add another one, you must extra click on the plus button. Consequence: The ergonomy of Trimaran is rather bad, even compared to our old system. Moreover: confusing menus; in freetext: if the last typed key is a space, than the cursor after a while suppresses the space so that, if you enter something after a pause, it will be added without the space. The editor 'Martha' is less comfortable than even the old WordPerfect, and there are less possibilities as to specific needs for chemists, for instance subscript and superscript. I do not like that the return button will not only create a new line, but that the new line has a larger space to the last line. And this can apparently not be changed.
Negative	Too many clicks necessary for performing most tasks. Moreover, it is unbelievable for a mere XML editor (because that's basically what it is) to be so slow and so heavy. PLEASE get rid of Java and start anew. Put USERS first this time, not programmers.
Negative	Too many clicks needed
Negative	Too many clicks!
Negative	Too many gadgets which are not necessary for our work, i.e. CASEX would have been enough, extra 'Search Reports' etc. are superfluous when doing S&E direct in one go: You do a search, write a letter, send it out - that's it
Negative	Too many whistles and bells but very little substance in its new features. Money not well spent. Full of bugs and inconsistencies.
Negative	Trimaran brings some slight improvements (auto fill-in of PCT Item V), at the cost of significant degradation elsewhere (Martha??? give me back a REAL word processor, please, please, please!). The main issue is that, already in its first version, the Trimaran interface is cluttered (panes, sub-panes, tabs, sub-tabs). It is designed with a very precise workflow in mind, for which it already provides a intricate way through, and anything falling outside of this 'standard' case becomes very, very complicated. One may anticipate that, as it evolves to accomodate further procedures and fix bugs, Trimaran will become even more cluttered, to the point where it will collapse under its own weight. I see you mention customisation and accelerator keys. Nice joke! These are implemented only to the point where a checkbox can be ticked in the feature list, but not to be actually usable and useful. Actually no 'Cellule de suivi' working with USABILITY in mind should have let Trimaran be released.
Negative	Trimaran did not deliver what it promised for the users. Comparing what it does with what caesar plus casex did, we go almost no new, improved functionalities. But we did get: much worse ergonomics (for instance, lots of useless clicking necessary), much worse word processor (for instance, ludicrous spell checking and almost no format options),...
Negative	Trimaran does not help you going through the different stages of search and examination ... it simply allows you to do so, in most of the cases ?! A professional software should help you all the time: indicate your choices, give you advice, propose ways forward .. reduce the needed 'clicks' to the minimum, etc.!
Negative	Trimaran has stability, responsiveness and design issues that affect work directly. Trimaran and the applications that go with it - viewer, internal, +cla, have ergonomics and integration problems that are just annoying to me personally.

Negative	Trimaran is a little step forward from what we had, but the quality of our tools it is still incredibly low and limits productivity in a big way.
Negative	Trimaran is mouse-oreiented and it is very difficult or time consuming to use it without the mouse. Response time is too high. Many bugs. Time consuming behaviours, like cancelling the comments of the appli docs for a votum when regenerating said appli docs; difficult to understand how to handle multiple-request applications. Compulsory reprinting of the search report when modification only take place in the written opinion.
Negative	Trimaran is not super 'intutive' when it comes down to give in documents of a file (e.g. aux reqests, etc) in connection with a grant or refusal.
Negative	Trimaran kann als ein 'RSI-Vörderprogramm' bezeichnet werden!
Negative	Trimaran should have cost 40 million-E and now we are dependent on a small software-company in Germany. The purpose of leaving the user-friendly WordPerfect was to become independent. The reasons given for not taking WORD are absurd. Furthermore newer versions than WordPerfect-6 exist. As usual the time wasted by 2000 examiners learning new commands to be able to do LESS than was possible in WordPerfect is totally ignored by management. Why dont we abolish the cleaners here and save money ? The examiners can clean their offices they can cope with everything, they have almost nothing to do anyway.
Negative	Trimaran slows down the process, because it requires more mouse actions and because it is user-unfriendly. The word processor is garbage, it's like going back to the stone age...
Negative	unfriendly way of working imposed by the system, go arounds of this makes the work even harder.
Negative	Unlogical. Lots of missed opportunities. Bigger or two screens needed.
Negative	Unstable releases with bugs. Extremely poor design especially of the interface for creating the search report. Too much clicking to get what you need.
Negative	User friendliness, response time, ergonomics and customisation/accelerator keys of Trimaran are continuously degrading since its introduction. Only stability remains quite stable
Negative	User interface is not taught trough. Especially prior art / citations is bad. This has been designes on a Wednesday afternoon. Very cloggy screen. Clicking does not function properly. System does not react as one would expect. Martha is not excellent, but quite workable.
Negative	very poor ergonomy, shity text editor (Martha), large amount of bugs,...
Negative	Viele Komponenten von Trimaran haben sich verschlechtert, z.B. Editor Marta und viele wichtige Features sind immer noch nicht implementiert, z.B. automatische Speicherung der Working List im Viewer. Die Version 2.25 ist deutlich instabiler als die Vorgängerversion, wurde aber trotzdem verteilt !
Negative	way to slow, poor ergonomics (data entry for a search report !)
Negative	Whay do they have to update the crap all the time. Last time this blocked my searches and maked the computer loseing the connection to the server. It took the desk service one week to fix it for one of my files.
Negative	Why?
Negative	you need more clicks for doing a task (one to activate the region the second to click the button), text editor very poor, logic behind the workflow sometimes not understandable.
Neutral	. slow . problems with migration . not fully multitask
Neutral	1) added comments to cited documents cannot be seen directly on the screen as it was possible in the old caesar version
Neutral	A few features are an impürovement as compared to before. However, many more clicks are necessary than before for the same result. No time improvement.
Neutral	a lot of bugs...
Neutral	After all I could re-establish my old work flow (as with Casex).

Neutral	application documents cumbersome, standard clauses not convenient (lot of clicks), printing of search report every time it is sent, a lot of clicks in general, no direct access to Martha (intermediate page), Martha should be independent from the rest
Neutral	As long as you do only 'normal' things, Trimaran works. Like every newly introduced application program, the most critical bugs are patched in Version 2 at the earliest ...
Neutral	As most users I am positive by some parts and negative by some in Trimaran, this kind of survey is pointless. You could just as well have asked if we prefer good weather or bad wheather, or why not a pay rise? what do you expect with a survey like this? To show that people are unhappy in general?
Neutral	CASEX/Cesar was more practical and intuitive. And not to forget the long experience and routine we had with working with CASEX/Cesar...
Neutral	concept 2 en 1 OK mais certains menus ou fonctions sont plus difficilement accessible ou trouvable.. notamment pour les non-unités et les oppo. De plus, la partie 'application documents' pour les oppo devrait être consultable par le 1ier et 2nd membre sans que chacun doive resaisir les pages et numéros des revendications
Neutral	ergonomically negative,functions for search slightly positive, reponse time slightly negative, overview over the whole file positive
Neutral	Ergonomics - too many clicks necessary Non unity searches - does not work properly
Neutral	Ergonomics and user-friendlyness have worsened compared to caesar/casex
Neutral	ergonomics are pretty bad. A lot of improvements compared to casex/caesar, but essential/simple features (entering passages per hand f.i.) got worse. Very slow when working from home.
Neutral	Far too much clicks to draft a search report, lot of time lost
Neutral	Good intentions but with bad programming performance in many locations you get an ergonimic disaster! When do the EPO realise that they do not have (and should not have) the required inhouse skills for this. Leave it to the proffs!
Neutral	I appreciate that some disturbing bugs in CASEX have been eliminated. However, Trimaran is in many respects more complicated to handle, and not user friendly enough.
Neutral	I fear that the good ideas for developing Trimaran will never show up because of far too many legal changes necessary.
Neutral	I had a problem with Trimaran it seems nobody could resolve it. The response time for my problem was extremely slow and the solution from the application support team was 'it works on their machine'. Too bad that on my machine did not work.
Neutral	I was told that after filling in the last Trimaran survey some months ago, we would get the results. We never did.
Neutral	If there was not the Martha Editor I would be positive about Trimaran, but my negative opinion on the Martha Editor downgrades seriously my overall opinion.
Neutral	It does what it should do, but its user friendliness has even decreased after the latest update. MARTHA isn't really up to standard, in comparison with Word Perfect from the 90ies, or the open source word processors such as OpenOffice.
Neutral	It has some nice and convenient features, no doubt. Martha is not so good though, esp. loss of data during writing and the spell checker are unbearable. We definitely need a chemical dictionary in the spell checker.
Neutral	It is a shame that with introduction of Trimaran speechbuddy was not fully adapted to Trimaran. It is also not understandable that the office does not provides standard clauses with parameters (for example for the facts and submissions).
Neutral	It is quite tricky and sophisticated.
Neutral	It is rather tedious to use the text editor (Marta). There is still no equation editor. A paragraph numbering tool a little bit more sophisticated would be very helpful. The compulsory reprint of the search-report when it is resent is superflous.

Neutral	It is surprising that changes such as the ones related to Raising the Bar are apparently not brought into the tool ,sufficiently quick.
Neutral	It is unacceptably slow and still buggy as hell. The interface design does not achieve at all its allegedly primary goal, namely to reduce the overall number of mouseclicks necessary to complete an action. The contrary is true. However, it does have some nice features, like the citation manager and the editor. Particularly the latter is well done, I think. Some may complain about its reduced functionality, but actually it performs the tasks it is designed for really well.
Neutral	It's gotten better with the latest release
Neutral	many improvements donein the last 2 years but more efforts should be focused on the user friendliness and automated workflow
Neutral	Many more mouse-clicks, some of them due to the inertia of teh system
Neutral	Marta sometimes hangs up; I find it highly annoying that when I switch from Marta to e.g. Citations, Marta is closed, so that every time I want to re-enter Marta I have to re-open it. I have reported this already months ago, but nothing has happened yet.
Neutral	Martha text editor and correction facility suck. Some functionalities are difficult to find and not intuitive. It does seem to be fairly stable, though and teh 'text compare' may prove very useful.
Neutral	navigation between fields and between windows is still awkward. Many things that could have fit on a single window (e.g. classes/titles) are still too many clicks apart, but then one does not know whether there is still enough budget to implement good ideas, or whether, as usual, the EPO has already decided to develop something else. All in all, it is stable enough to fulfill the needs, and does the job well enough.
Neutral	Newer versions should be better tested before installation to examiners computers: comfort regressions were noticed with the very latest versions... A nice step compared to the previous Caesar/Casex, but it could still be much improved.
Neutral	No possibility to override senseless functions or to delete actions made up by mistake! ! !
Neutral	No real interaction search - exam, always copy-paste necessary to transfer text, no library of text passages, application documents are a mess, standard clauses interface is totally outdated, dealing with doublures still is cumbersome (divisionals, PCT->EP, FA->EP), classification issues, etc. Most of these issues were not intended to be addressed by Trimaran. The EPO should have saved the time and money spent. Trimaran offers too little in return for the user.
Neutral	Not enough experience with and without Trimaran
Neutral	not sufficiently stable, too many crashes
Neutral	Now that I took quite some months to accustom myself to the quirks and peculiarities of Tr!maran, please improve it but DO NOT CHANGE EXAMINER SOFTWARE AGAIN !
Neutral	Only Martha is a mess !!!
Neutral	quite slow from time to time
Neutral	recent change to 2.25b: for writing communications for adding the documents, standard clauses etc now 2 mouse clicks are needed against one in the earlier version: such changes are done without thinking about the user and thought about computer use (cq health)
Neutral	Since in the end I don't find a clear advantage in Trimaran, I wonder why we've had to go through the effort of changing. For the ones who made the decision is just about money, but for the examiners it's been a lot of time and energy that have not been taken into account when measuring our productivity for this year.
Neutral	since we have trimaran, the system is much slower. Insufficient training during the transfer made staff lose a lot of time themselves to find out by try and error. I lost some 20 hours overall...without to deduct this time.
Neutral	SOme features OK and even good, but some atrocious. The worst one is the 'Prior art' section.
Neutral	Still room for much improvement. Trimaran is a sideways step with a slight improvements in some areas but a worsening in other areas
Neutral	Still slow and still not accustomed to easily find back all the necessary buttons and shortcuts.

Neutral	Such a micro-survey comprising only a single very general question is completely useless. Unfortunately, I clicked an opinion before I noticed that there was only only question.
Neutral	The editor is sh....
Neutral	The editor Martha needs lots of improvements.
Neutral	The ergonomics could be improved a lot
Neutral	The idea and the concept behind Trimaran is great but it does not work properly and the user (examiner) looses loads of time trying to sort out issues not related to search/examination, not to mention the multitude of bugs.
Neutral	The requirement to always reprint the search report, when there is a change to the opinion leads to a waste of paper.
Neutral	The response time is extremely slow (adding a citation, changing a paragraph number...) and becomes slower when opening several dossiers in Trimaran, requiring a restart of SEA application. The text editor is not at the level of the former editor and certainly not at the one of Word.
Neutral	The response times to switch between items in a dossier for example 'classes/titles' and 'Citations' is still way too long normally up to 2 seconds
Neutral	The 'send function' is not working properly. FO request me to re-send it again. Sometimes, the classification of document has to be entered after each opening of dossiers.
Neutral	The survey looks ridiculously cheap.
Neutral	The text editor (martha) is scrap
Neutral	The Trimaran Editor is painstakingly slow, at times.
Neutral	There are some glitches nobody can explain. I find it totally unacceptable that I should spend 1/2 hour wondering what went wrong and asking colleagues and the WUC only to be told later, after contacting Helpdesk that they don't know either where the glitch is. Further, if ROSS is compulsory why isn't there a check for ROSS like for any other feature.
Neutral	There are some improvements over Caser/Caesar but I can't stop thinking how much time and money te office invested in it. Do you also say in English 'The elephant gave birth to a mouse' ?
Neutral	There are too many different shortcuts so I tend not to use them becaus it is so hard memorising them.
Neutral	There should be no more than one 'upgrade' every two months. Every 'upgrade' to one part of SEA results in problems in other parts of SEA because only the part 'upgraded' appears to be tested, NOT the whole program JAVA.EXE.
Neutral	There were some new interesting features introduced and it definitely represents a step forward. Nevertheless, it falls short of expectations as there are simply too many lost opportunities: - Trimaran could offer a far more intelligent 'communication template tool' with standard clauses being introduced according to parameter selection and enabling cascading of STC's; - the dossier parameters could contain 10X more useful information (appl, date, applicant, number, D1, D2, ...); - the Application-Docs could be filled-out automatically (with manual confirmation) - The MARTHA editor offers no single advantage with respect to MS-WORD and is short of many features (predictive writing, for instance). - there are too many useless fields everywhere which compromise the usability of the system; - Last but not least, bugs are always to be expected when a new product is released, but it is also true that this has severe consequences on user satisfaction. This becomes particularly frustrating, when new versions introduce new bugs. It appears that the established Software-development
Neutral	to fill out the search report the situation is worse compared with the pre-trimaran period - the clicking on different icons to fill out the search report has increased

Neutral	too many clicks necessary. too many options that are never needed. all in all not worth the effort introducing a new system.
Neutral	Too much clicking.
Neutral	Trimaran appears to be a bit too complex making the daily work not always easier
Neutral	Trimaran is still slow (in particular when opening windows) and causes at least as often crashes of SEA as CEASEAR/CASSEX did. There are also still many bugs to be fixed... The editor (in particular that of the NON-Unity/Incomplete Search-Text-Box of the search report where not even underlined characters are possible) are of DOS-standard and not on a modern level.
Neutral	Trimaran would have required more testing before deployment. Overall, the ergonomics is rather low and should have required more early design efforts.
Neutral	Try and error - das Übliche halt, bis sich der user an die ewigen bugs gewöhnt hat.
Neutral	user friendliness and ergonomics are pretty poor, some relatively common choices are quite well hidden or curiously positioned, and the response time is mediocre.
Neutral	very bad on the ergonomic aspect, response time
Neutral	Viel zu unübersichtlich ...
Neutral	While some form filling functions have been synchronised between the search and examination reports, not all functionalities of word or its spin off have been utilised. Full text databases for files shall be rapidly implemented to improve productivity and quality. As well mobile working from outside the office for examination work shall also be implemented. It appears that IT progress at the office follows its own path but is too slow by far to adapt more rapidly to modern technology. Last but not least, how not commenting on the choices of WPerfect intead of Word some years ago, home programmed CAESAR or CASEX not Java complient at a time it should have been envisaged. The only positive comment in respect of Trimaran is that this time the choices made appear to be somehow logical.
Neutral	Working with Trimaran forces you to use your mouse really very often and I noticed since the change that my right hand hurts from that... And all the bugs are anoying (especially when having adoublure)
Positive	..although there is certainly room for further improvement, and resources should be made available to support such development.
Positive	1. Es gibt noch sehr viel Verbesserungsmöglichkeiten. 2. Das Schlimmste sind Änderungen die nicht wirklich Verbesserungen sind, und Überraschungen mit sich bringen.
Positive	1. Occasionally files do not appear in CASEX despite being sent. A call to helpdesk can fix that, but there definitely is a bug. 2. A lot of paper is wasted because one can not pick which pages are (re-)printed with i.e. the Search Report. 3. Citations of XP documents have misplaced and missing commas; generally it would be nice to omit the double dates, e.g. 3 March 2003 (2003-03-03), the latter suffices.
Positive	a lot of features are an improvement. New versions too often have too many bugs i.e. one big bug which blocks the whole office.
Positive	A reminder on a survey 1 working day after the initial note is rather pushing it, not ?
Positive	A survey based on a single question is hardly suitable to test user satisfaction. Moreover, who do you think is likely to respond? Those that are happy or those that are unhappy? I guess that there is a good chance that in particular the latter ones will see their chance to raise their voice. Solution: Random selection of colleagues = representative sample. Further, where to set the standard? Casex/Caesar, SEA 2.23b? In my view the more interesting question would be: Would you prefer to return to CASEX/Caesar? Here you would learn whether Trimaran is perceived as an improvement. Finally, what will you deduct from the answers? If someone ticks positive, is this person aiming to indicate that everything is perfect? This person could equally mean, well there are things that need to be improved, but Trimaran is way better than CASEX/Caesar. These conclusions could equally be associated with someone ticking neutral. And what would you conclude if people are negative. Do they mean to say that they want to return to

Positive	All in all, Trimaran is a major improvement compared to Caesar/Casex. The most annoying disadvantages (before SEA 2.25 - haven't had time to check whether fixed now) are: - Multi-level indention such as with F7 in WP is not really working - workaround with hidden legal numbering gives other indention than indention using the TAB key. - Passage entering with keyboard is unergonomic, especially for NPL citations, since navigation e.g. from page to column to paragraph is only possible if looking at the awkward Alt-Num combinations of the day and typing them in.
Positive	all new version with some questionabel changes - the only big negative poiint is that we have to use the mouse much more often for navigating through the different parts of e.g. a citation etc.
Positive	Big improvement wrt previous software.
Positive	But no time budget was given for adaptation. It took time to adapt ourselves to the new tool.
Positive	But there are always changes, and sometimes some helpful features such as already made communication in the light of the citations, are no more available.
Positive	Citations entry for cited documents still complicated and cumbersome
Positive	Compared to the former tool Trimaran provides good progress. Currently, the main concern I have are the response times that are very slow.
Positive	Compared to the 'old' Casex is a huge improvement. I can understand that 'bugs' are fixed 'on-the-go' and like any new tool it can be improved. This is the reason why I did not choose the 'very positive' opinion.
Positive	could be faster staring up, i would prefer a blank trimaran window with every start-up, no default file loading
Positive	could be tidied up further
Positive	Data Flow Citation could become easier. XP-documents for scanning are sometimes supposed to be cited as a Serial, sometimes DB-Abstract, sometimes WPI-Abstract, sometimes Dw (I think that still means Derwent)....etc.
Positive	Editor Martha should work with ASCII-code such as 'ß' (alt-225). Inserting symbols like this is tideous.
Positive	ein gravierender Fehler des Text-Editors bestaht darin, daß das 'ß' nicht geschrieben werden kann (außer über ctrl-K).
Positive	'Entwicklung beim Kunden' noch nicht abgeschlossen!
Positive	ergonomics are bad, it should not be necessary to hit minuscule arrows with the mouse-pointer during the standard workflow of writing a search report...
Positive	Ergonomy of citing the relevant passages of prior art documents should be significantly improved (both the display and the number of mouse clicks needed). All in all, very good, change as little as possible!!!
Positive	Especially the features of the new text editor are a big improvement
Positive	Especially the latest version is a significant improvement. Keep up the good work, keep asking users what their priorities are for the next versions.
Positive	Even more integration of the different tools would be good.
Positive	Generally very good, but still some smaller bugs
Positive	Good ergonomy, handling of non-unity very improved, direct link to workin lists with interaction is very good. Text processor much too slow in full screen modus and misses some important formatting/font options. Text processor does not include GRAMMATIK, but only orthograph corrector.
Positive	grammar chek incomplet
Positive	Haven't tried customising keys. Editor limited compared WordPerfect but 'fit for purpose' and less cumbersome by miles than M$ Word.
Positive	hiding' the buttons to insert the application documents and cited documents in a pull down menu wa not a wise choice. please bring back the icons in the toolbar.
Positive	I am a newcomer (01.09.2009) and have only worked with Trimaran.

Positive	I am not going to collect a new search report from the LAN printer everytime I need to reprint a WO-ISA/ESOP. In any case the formalities don't seem to notice the little number on it any way! (WHAT A WASTE OF PAPER!)
Positive	I am realistic enough to know that any computer system can be down from time to time...with Trimaran it is not too often in fact. Overall I am really satisfied.
Positive	I do not give a 'Very positive' because the editor (Marta) is a stone age editor...there is (a lot of) room for improvement for this programm
Positive	I don't feel that Trimaran is as good as it could be/could have been, but it is generally much better than the previous Caesar/Casex combination. The integration with the Viewer is also a much-welcome improvement.
Positive	I find that we need to click more overall. Also that sometimes the Editor is very slow, that is, I write something and it takes a couple of seconds to appear on the screen. I am not a particularly fast typer, although I do use all fingers. it would also be great if when printing from the editor, we were given the option, as we had before, of printing current page. That would save keystrokes for sure.
Positive	I just started at the office 1.5 years ago, so I have not an overall experience with Trimaran.
Positive	I like Trimarin. The only slight glitch I noticed is that sometimes when trying to make font into bold, the button hangs in an intermediate state and I have to click a second time. Not problematic, just a bit bothersome
Positive	I think that the integrated concept as developped by Trimaran is an good think. The text editor is also Ok because there are not a lot of nasty possibilities and we can ask collegues because everybody works on the same shape.
Positive	Idea OK, too many bugs and strange things you can or cant do, one example Aux requests
Positive	I'm a brand new user, but even during the learning I can say that it's very user friendly.
Positive	Improve some functions in the Editor
Positive	improvement of the ergonomics of the word processor 'marta', to many clicks necessary to insert standart clauses, citations...
Positive	In general positive, some drawbacks are still in user friendliness / ergonomics, such as finding of functions which are less frequently used, but improvement over the normal feedback via WUC and Helpdesk to be taken into account in subsequent rollouts seems to be on its way, necessarily step by step, but Rome hasn't been built in a day. I think it is in principle a good idea to integrate Search and Examination related functions and, to me, Trimaran seems to have implemented this in a workable way.
Positive	in general very positive, but the ergonomics (compatibility with speech buddy is very very poor....)
Positive	In general, TRIMARAN is an improvement, but in detail, the implementation is extremely 'shortsighted' programmed and many actions still require, and this is my MAIN COMPLAINT i) too many clicks ii) too many large mouse movements (over the whole screen) 'mouse milage too high' iii) illogicial locations for the actions and sub-actions in the table of contents iv) no free style, too many form entries necessary
Positive	In Martha there is no accelerator-key for 'Strikethrough' (e.g. like CTRL+B for 'Bold'). That would help me, as use it in nearly every communication.
Positive	Introducing NPL citations is still rather cumbersome. Please keep up the good work in improving the user friendliness of ALL aspects of the system, even if examiners cite less NPL than patents...
Positive	It has much improved compared to the early days. The only thing I'm still missing is the equation editor in Martha.
Positive	It is a bit too complicated and some functions are not logical, e.g. application docs. Overall, however it is good, and certainly a vast improvement over casex/caesar (which isn't saying much, though..)
Positive	it is not perfect, but betther than caesar+casex
Positive	It seems to be more reliable and allow more flexible working than the previous arrangement.
Positive	It still needs some improvement (ergonomics...) but my opinion is overall positive!
Positive	It took me some time to get used to Trimaran, and it could have probably been better designed, but now I know where everithing is and I can work pretty good with it.
Positive	It would be good to be able to choose to print (again) the Search report or not.

Positive	It would be nice, when classes are already assigned to a file in 'classement interne' (eg. A2 file) that these could automatically assigned as consulted classes in that window and as IPC classes too. This would save unnecessary duplication of work.
Positive	It's a highly specialised and customised program - we must not put the same plug & play expectations to it like for a million times sold highstreet code - and especially not mix up problems coming from the program and PEBKAC... however, a release of a new version seems to result pretty often in at least one major new problem, which shouldn't be the case ...!?
Positive	It's a pity some ergonomic functionalities have been replaced by less ergonomic ones in the last version, e.g. in Martha: icons (for introduction standard clauses, documents, passages, ...)replaced by pull-down menu with many mouse clicks.
Positive	It's improving all the time. Major limits are the ergonomics (data transfer between applications and moving around between different views of trimaran)
Positive	It's not worse than the old system, although there is room for improvement.
Positive	latest versions include features which make it worse e.g.: the standard clauses button in the upper tool bar - when writing a com - has disappeared! This is one of the most frequently used function! It now requires many clicks, or waste time to reconfigur/customize one's toolbar!
Positive	Like every new software, you have to get use to the new ergonomics, then it's ok. I would like to have one click commeands rather than the 2 clicks as it is now.
Positive	Loading of a file is very slow (1 minute). Another drawback is the way the citations have to be filled in: for one citation, the category, passage etc appear below the citation, and it is sometimes very difficult (too small window) to work with (it is not ergonomic and no overview is possible). I would rather have only the citation appearing on the left and another window on the right for all features we have to fill in (category, yello sticker, dossier comments, passages etc). I have the impression I click a lot (much more than before Trimaran) within the citations to get to the passage I need to fill in. Another detail: when checking the file, the errors appear in a small window, too small to be able to read the text correctly and to click to the icon at the end. Thank you, S. Mill
Positive	Martha bugs should be removed!
Positive	Martha Editor missing features for efficient examiner work: - save and edit files on local hard disk - allow for editing 2 files in 2 windows at the same time!!!!! - the enlarged editor window should stay open while messing round in Trimaran
Positive	Martha Editor, time it takes to open a file are not perfect yet...
Positive	Martha is not very flexible and some things are just impossible or very cumbersome to achieve.
Positive	Martha's editor is much more stable today than a year ago. But, sometimes, depending on the size of the file or communication, it is still problematic.
Positive	Minor teething problems: 1 when printing the SO the SR is also printed although no changes were made. 2 Many words are missing in the disctionary used of spell check 3 a little slow response 4 30% of the ESOP I send still do not reach the formality and i have to send them twice (don't know if Trimaran is resonsible for that).
Positive	missing more options for page layout of the communications, as well as a tool for writing mathematical formulas. Thx.
Positive	My comment is not about Trimaran but about the computer start up process in the morning: it takes me about 10 minutes to start up my computer, to wait for the updates and to start up Lotus Notes. It is too much. Before it was much faster.
Positive	My overall opinion is positive, but there are still too many bugs!!!!
Positive	Negative point is that changes in layout and functionality are not always indicated when switching to a new version. Changing to a new version fixes old bugs, but unfortunately, most of the time also comes with many new bugs.

Positive	Negative: the GUI of the editor changed, i.e. buttons disappeared. Please make the button list configurable !
Positive	Not perfect but for sure a giant leap forward.
Positive	Not perfect but much better than Caesar/Casex. Continuous new releases seem to address the bugs and bring improvements in handling.
Positive	on many buttons you need to click twice for anything to happen (eg. if you want to change from separate sheet to citations in the left window). this is annoying and not ergonomic.
Positive	On the whole Trimaran is okay, but the quality of the editor leaves a lot to be desired, but at least it doesn't crash like Word used to. What I also find really annoying is that on each update, certain useful functions are removed.
Positive	One has to '(mouse-)click' a lot (sometimes too much!!). Apart from it, it's a real improvement!
Positive	only negative point: still too much mouse clicking (RSI)
Positive	Only the negative comments: - it is annoying that the 'separate sheet'-window with the Search Opinion closes each time one changes something to the citations part. - Also, concerning citations: the function to add reference information (page numbers, paragraphs, ...) is slow to react when pressing on the button to add a line for page numbers, figures, paragraphs,... - An examiner should be able to indicate that there is an error from the system concerning doublures (only possibility is Full and Partial refund). We had the case of a 'wrongly' identified doublure. Basically, the application that had been searched was exactly the same as an other one which had not been paid and which had been withdrawn. The system still recognized the searched application as a doublure (which is not correct).
Positive	Overall a good working tool
Positive	Overall improvements for the user over the previous system could be better.
Positive	Overall positive, however the response time is sometimes slow and Trimaran is not free of bugs.
Positive	Overall, the suite works fine, but I'd like to have Martha accessible as standalone program (or have Martha replaced by something which exists as standalone program, but that seems more difficult to me)
Positive	please get rid of the known bugs...
Positive	Please include a spell checker for the DOSYS field TXT. Thank you!
Positive	points to be improved: - handling of main and auxiliary requests, in particular when some requests have to be added later 'in between' the already existing requests - response time (it feels like Trimaran is lagging behind by 0.5sec) - during auto-save it sometimes happens that the cursor on the text field is reset to the top of the page, i.e. when the file is auto-saved during typing, the user continues typing at the top of the page without first noticing it
Positive	positive but it could still use quite some improvements
Positive	Printing from CLA 'improved' a lot: 4 clicks instead of one or two. Also the latest 2 versions of SEA 'condensed' under a single droplist the most used options-like 'Use standard clause' The dual-core is not optimal used: if eg JViewer processes a list, nothing can be done in eg Trimaran during this time And my personal issue: focus steal (windows issue) However, there were lots of improvements :)
Positive	Quelques bugs encore présents mais dans l'ensemble un bel outil. Continuez à le stabiliser!
Positive	Quite a few versions in very short succession, whereby functionality and appearance changes, which makes it difficult to acquaint oneself fully with the application.
Positive	Quite intuitive to use, increases my work speed
Positive	rather stable, easier handling of complicated history of requests, maybe a bit confusing at the beginning
Positive	response time is slightly long on average, stability is satisfying, user friendlyness good, ergonomics good. I do not use the accelerator keys so far.
Positive	response time should be improved. In some cases, it is necessary to click two times (to add a citation passage, or to display some information in the left or right panels, whereas one click would suffice). Stability has improved since the first roll-off of Trimaran.
Positive	Retrieve Biblio-Data via DOI is still not implemented! :-(
Positive	Search report: Input of information concerning cited prior art and classification could be made more user-friendly. If more details from my side are wished, please contact me (C.Heiner, Tel. 7628)

Positive	Send & Print' of Search Report + ESOP without printing the Search Report should be made available. Paper savings when the dossier has to be sent again for any reason (e.g. corrections in the ESOP).
Positive	should have more possibilities to customise short-cut keys and repetitive operations
Positive	Significantly better than what we had before, still room for improvement.
Positive	Small minor annoyances like: - when filling in the sources the tick box for all sources does not work properly - when changing a screen (e.g. Grant -> Citations), the response time is slow (it takes more than a second to switch planes sometimes) it does not feel right and work flow is disturbed.
Positive	Some applications leave you very little freedom in composing (e.g. application documents force you first to erase the earlier ones you don't want to erase and another example is that a new citation of a document in exam phase force you to input it all manually)
Positive	Some aspects are not as good as beforehand: e.g. - 'Application documents' at the Grant stage is 'bricolage' and not very handy; - the central NU function is questionable, as NU is, in my view, mainly stage dependent (NU at search is generally overcome later); - quite slow too react (opening windows etc.). But overall, it is a nice tool!
Positive	some ergonomic issues remain to be solved (citation passages acess etc.)
Positive	Some features of Trimaran are active in one SEA-Version, not active in the next, once again active in the following version, eventually with slight, but not always positive, modifications, and all this without prior consultation of staff. That's a bit annoying.
Positive	some functions are not user friendly (hard to find where it should be clicked) but overall opinion positive
Positive	Some of the features in the editor Martha could be improved. Especially the possibilities of paragraph formatting.
Positive	Some stuff still needs fine tuning but it's a lot better than Ceasar/Casex by now.
Positive	Sometimes there are still performance problems going from the editor to other functions, for example, the citations, it seems a bit slow and often I have to click a button twice before getting the result. Thanks.
Positive	Sometimes things which were working well are gone with the next release. Thus new releases are always a big risk/surprise. Because of this I don't invest any time in customisation of Trimaran's editor (e.g. the auto correction) anymore and can't benefit from this possibilty.
Positive	sometimes very slow
Positive	Stability could be increased! Non-Unity rather nasty to hack in, esp. as to claims and later additional fees paid. And I'm lacking the German ' - being DOWN before and up after, somewhat like ,,..." !!
Positive	Still a few things I'd like to be changed, but I can understand that not everybody has the same expectation...
Positive	still a lot left to improve but overall a good tool, a lot more liberty could and should be left to the individual user to set up menus and toolbars to personal preferences.
Positive	Still several bugs to solve, but editor is a LOT better than the Word Perfect based programm (out of the 1990 years) before.
Positive	stop changing things at every new version, it takes forever to find out where a button/box to tick has migrated after every new download. It made me loose a lot of time (and nerves)
Positive	strange concepts with changing focus between two windows... weird procedure to identify groups for found docs... application document input still cumbersome and intransparent...
Positive	Takes some getting used to, and things can be further improved, but this is certainly an improvement over Casex and Caesar.
Positive	Texteditor unzureichend, zB was die Tabulatoren betrifft (Shift-F7, etc.). Komplizierte und unlogische Bedienung bei Eingabe von Hilfsanträgen.
Positive	textsoftware in Trimaran is better than microsoft; actually any software is better than microsoft, which unfortunately had become in an unjustified way the most used software.

Positive	The application has slowed down since the SEA version 2.25.
Positive	The capabilities of the text processor are too limited, particularly with regard to tayloring of lists (with i),ii),... a),b),... I),II),... etc.), lack of equations editing, and absence of cross-referencing and foot-notes.
Positive	The change of buttons to a menu is strengthening; I needed some month to learn the buttons and then you changed them. Please keep the system for a longer time stable. I really appreciate your reaction to users comments but bear in mind, you can not satisfy the whole staff. When you introduce suuch changes, keep the 'old' version as an alternative in 'Preferences'
Positive	The Citation Window is not very user friendly. Tiring for entering data.
Positive	The editor could be improved by allowing more options for customization.
Positive	The embedded editor Marta is still behind my expectations both with respect to features and with respect to bugs.
Positive	The ergonomics still need a lot of improvement. Printing of search report and WROP or ESOP should not be linked.
Positive	The fact that any change - be it minor - in the written opinion accompanying the search report systematically leads to an up-issue of the search report seems to be unnecessary and to add to the burden of the formalities officers.
Positive	The integration of caesar, casex and viewer has brought some additional efficiency to the daily work. Also the initial issues with the editor appear to have been overcome.
Positive	The last updates however were a step back with numerous unconvenient changes. I hope that they will be overcome shortly.
Positive	the major points for improvement are the ergonomics (lot's of clicking) and the speed of Martha, especially when working from home.
Positive	The most important improvement over Casex is its stability - while my casex crushed regularly, sometimes 2 or 3 times a day, Trimaran runs without any problems. The 'one dossier concept' of linking e.g. ESOP and search report is better than the previous independent actions. Several small things still need improvement (ergonomy). The most important feature that needs to be improved is speed: when a click trigges loading anything, it takes a second or two. That sound not like a big deal but when you work with it the whole day, it really gets on your nerves. But overall: well done, IT
Positive	The only problem I see, is that in case of an amendment in the communication after having already initiated 'Sent', the search report has to be reprinted again.
Positive	The panel regarding citations does work worse as in previous versions, as you need to click a lot more on the + and > signs as before, in order to get to the next passage indication or to the next citation.
Positive	The progress since previous generation is anyway VERY positive Some bugs remains in the editor.
Positive	The question could have been: what do you prefer: Caesar/Casex or Trimaran? It is true that Trimaran is not perfect, but I would NEVER want to have Caesar/Casex back!
Positive	The rating in relation with the previous tools. For maintenance, up-dates, bug fixes, etc => NEGATIVE
Positive	The response time is very low! It takes 4-5 min to download the work list manager
Positive	the response time should be enhanced !
Positive	The spell checker needs improvement.
Positive	The system should be improved in a couple of points which tend to generate mistakes
Positive	the text editor is very bad, otherwise happy with the application
Positive	The text editor still has room for improvement... A draft print function like it existed in Caesar would be desirable as well, so that the comments field could be extracted automatically
Positive	The text programme Martha is better than the previous Casex. The input of citations (former Caesar) etc. could be improved.

Positive	The triangles that one has to click on when filling the comments and passages in the citations panel are extremely small. This window could be improved.
Positive	The typing in of Application documents at grant stage is not so optimal. It is stupid that the Search Report has to be prined again, when changing something in the Communication, a lot of paper waist!
Positive	The worst point is the text editor Martha. I think that Word Perfect was much better.
Positive	There are some annoying bugs and senseless functions. This last e.g.: send and print together. If I modified the ESOP I don´t want to print the search report again but unfortunately I cannot avoid it. If I add the default sources in the search report the serr codes are not correct.
Positive	There could still be progress but the software is a step in the right direction.
Positive	There is still room for an improvement of the ergonomy and shortcuts.
Positive	there would still some user-interface improvements (too many clicks) helpful like at the insertion of the citations (passages, sources, etc.)
Positive	This question is rather meaningless.
Positive	Though word editing is not optimal, the links between Trimaran and the other SEA-applications represent a clear improvement.
Positive	Time allocated for training and getting used to the system was too little
Positive	To many clicks, not very ergonomic !!
Positive	to reduce the amount of paper was no issue of the office, otherwise the search report + WO wouldn't be printed again if you correct an error in the written opinion
Positive	Too frequent changes of minor issues which then worsen the situation while not addressing any real (maybe subjective) problems. After every change something which worked perfect before doesn't work anymore...
Positive	Too many clicks to fill in the Search Report in comparison with Caesar. Why having supressed the very important quick access to 'Insert a standard clause' in the last release ?
Positive	Tri ist eine super basis für die zukunft. da es neben der datenbank (internal) DAS kern-werkzeug in unserem arbeitsalltag ist, sollten ausreichend recourcen für eine nutzergerechte weiterentwicklung bereit gestellt werden - nicht nur für's bug-fixen beim helpdesk. derzeit hat tri gefühlt (!) etwa die leistungskraft der programme, die das amt schon vor 15 jahren hatte - es ist zwar schön, dass tri funktioniert, jedoch kein grund bei der entwicklung jetzt aufzuhören; das wahre potenzial dieses werkzeuges ist nur ansatzweise zu erkennen; speziell wir prüfer verdienen in absehbarer zeit werkzeuge, die zeitgemäss sind. meine bitte: tri weiter entwickeln, wie ursprünglich geplant - einen bleistift ohne spitzer kann man auch nicht voll nutzen...
Positive	Trimaran has succesfully fulfilled its aim of bringing search and examination into just one platform. Many issues still remain, such as user-friendliness of applications. In particular the search reports are cumbersome and difficult to fill and the text processor could be better.
Positive	Trimaran is a big improvement over the previous flow.
Positive	Trimaran is a major improvement over Casex/Ceasar and I am very glad that this improvement was made. However, it sometimes blocks when sending & printing the search report and the search opinion and the only solution is to restart SEA and resend. This could still be improved.
Positive	Trimaran is more ergonomical than Casex/Caesar, but further improvements could be made. See my suggestions SB20100551 and SB20100549.
Positive	Trimaran is on the whole very good for a new system. However a suggestion that would have increased efficiency i.e. direct importation of claims into the CRDR box for writing the search scope was not implemented. Hence, the development team don't seem very responsive to user needs. Therefore cannot give 'very positive' at ther moment.

Positive	Trimaran is quite nice concerning the functionality, especially the increased integration w.r.t. Caesar/Casex. The problem is rather the interaction, i.e. it is sometimes slow and often twice clicking on a window etc. for getting the focus is necessary.
Positive	Two main problems: copy-paste with non-unity doublure files, and automatic print of the search report with the communication (ESOP, WOISA, WOFA)
Positive	Two slight comments: 1. redondance between citations and prior art is not usefull (at least for me). 2. I don't understand why 'NU/Incomplete' is not under 'Search Report' in the tree of actions.
Positive	un menu déroulant automatique pour les boutons serait le bienvenu...
Positive	UNFORTUNATELY, today a few litte changes for the worse were introduced. It was sort of a shock when I experienced that Trimaran was actually a real improvement over the old situation, but now we seem to take the first step on the usual slow winding road to decline again :(.
Positive	When selecting characters with right-mouse or shift_arrow in the editor, the editor inverse-colours more characters than are actually selected. I think this is a serious error. Further the editor is not yet fully windows-compatible. For instance word deletion with ctrl_del (forward) or ctrl_backspace (backwards) is missing. Further it should be possible to switch off the printing of a new search report when uploading the work, just as one can switch off the printing of the other forms, pages and search opinion text.
Positive	When the ESOP is changed after having selected send it is necessary to print again the search report. Perhaps it is possible in the future to avoid this waste of paper.
Positive	Why can't we open more than one dossier at a time ? The fill-in of the passage is very tedious. Can't we send&print w/o printing the search report ? Allocation of the source to the cited prior art is very tedious. Can't we have the boxes for passages, user-comment in dosys, category directly open for one cited prior art, it's very tedious to click to open each of them; those 3 boxes have inevitably to be open, the rest obviously can be left unopen.
Positive	why during the last update, shortcut keys (alt + number) have been changed ??
Positive	Why putting the most important buttons in the editor (e.g. insert standard clause) from easy accessible buttons in the menu bar (previous version) into a pulldown menu (actual version)? That doesn't make any sense at all and is purely annoying. At least leave the user the option to configure the menu bar.
Slightly negative	Although I'm generally satisfied with TRIMARAN, I feel that the software is a 'monster' in terms of memory used and general slowness. Given that, on the client side, SEA/TRIMARAN should not be more than a form-filling GUI, I cannot understand how the software has gotten to be so bloated.
Slightly negative	As usual, user friendliness and ergonomics seem to be unknown concepts among the developers.
Slightly negative	bad ergonomics, user-unfriendly, too many clicks necessary, all A2 publication data should be accessible on a single page
Slightly negative	Bugs! I don't see such a big advantage over the old system to justify the time invested and the problems which frequently occur. Any new release is solving some issues and opening others.
Slightly negative	Complicated and very little user's friendly, in german: unübersichtlich.
Slightly negative	dealing with citations (too much clicking) and submissions (adding comments, more than one submission) is confusing and not intuitive
Slightly negative	does NOT always what it should do: stability: CASEX might have appeared old-fashioned, yet was more stable most of the time. User friendliness: Application docs (need I say more?) Response time: AWFULLY slow at startup Ergonomics: too many gadgets, gimmicks built-in by freaks? - Windows have to be enlarged in order to be able to fill in data (claim categories, Comments, passages etc.) - Windows have to made smaller again to get a proper overview over the cited documents Customisation: I didn't see any and I am not a programmer.
Slightly negative	editor does not provide the expected functionality, no footnotes possibe, no formulas, input into 'citations' is cumbersome and inconsistent

Slightly negative	Editors are much too slow; very bad from the ergonomic and oeconomic point of view: much more 'mouse click' operations necessary than in Caesar, 'verschachtelte Ansicht', automatic new print of search report aftereach send option, the only really good thing: it is finally again possible to load claims into the reports (this was also possible along time ago with the system then in use),
Slightly negative	Entering data for the search report requires more mouse clicks than previously with Ceasar.
Slightly negative	Ergonomics has deteriorated. For instance, now it is not possible to introduce claims 1, 6, 7, 9 in the citations by typing '1 6 7 9', but you must type '1, 6, 7, 9', so more typing is necessary than in CAESAR.
Slightly negative	Ergonomics is not good. I consistenly here that many more 'clicks' are necessary, an opinion which I share.
Slightly negative	Ergonomics is terrible. The functions are ok, but the interface is a disaster. The editor is not good enough.
Slightly negative	Ergonomics should be improved.
Slightly negative	Ergonomics: no real advantage compared to CAESAR/CASEX, the software rather tempts the user to use the mouse instead of the keyboard (see e.g. the most recent update where in Martha, a selection of prior art docs/standard clauses etc needs to be done in a scroll-down menu instead of separate buttons/keys, which existed before. Paper consumption: Sending an action is only possible when printing the whole search report. This is a clearly negative point since it leads to waste of paper. Application docs: inserting applic. docs into an existing sequence of docs is only possible at the end of the sequence, otherwise the most recent docs need to be deleted before inserting and the whole 'tree' needs to be built up from there.
Slightly negative	even more clicking in the new version (due to insert text button)
Slightly negative	Functionalities (i.e. what you can do with the application) are rather well handled, but ERGONOMY of the G.U.I. (Graphic Interface) is amongst the worst I have ever seen, so at the end I loose a bit more time looking at where are the functions I'm seeking to achieve that before...
Slightly negative	fundamentally it is not a bad concept. But it is and has become quite complicated, somewhat overcharged and hence userfriendliness suffers. There's lots of clicking: Most annoying: changes are made without telling, so one finds oneself with a new situation and has to find out alone. When importing docs saved in external file its a real mess (no order at all an hence lots of time invested to find the correct document....Also the setup for filling in doc, category, relevance to claims, passages of docs with these click-down windows is very burdensome and userunfriendly.Since some time one has to click several times until e.g. the click-down window for the filling in of passages opens...
Slightly negative	I am non-BEST examiner and for examination the system is workable, although it really doesn't look top of the pops.

Slightly negative	I believe that investing 10-20% of the money that trimaran has cost into further development of casex/caesar would have yielded much better results... Examiner were stuckk for years with casex/caesar which was neither maintained nior further developed: lost productivity for years was the obvious consequence... Trimaran has some positive aspects, but overall I consider it a setback, rather than progress plus it came at a high cost the epo is structurally unable to develop software (everybody would consider it strange if we started to construct cars, but software is so easy;-): in DG2 there are many conpletely incompetent colleagues (frustrated examiners from meachanics, chemistry, physics etc who want to play software engineer- please stop that nonsense and go for a PROFESSIONAL solution; management has not at all been able to deal with these structural issues) Nobody witha reasonable mindset would have introducte the java editor (Martha) into Trimaran. The EPO has already MS WORD installed on all machines and MS word is supported by modern tools such as Dragon (think RSI prevention, productivity);
Slightly negative	I find that the user interface is cumbersome, and requires too much user interaction (clicks) to get something done. Furthermore, improvements seen to only exacerbate the fact, as recently a series of toolbar buttons have been placed under a menu item in the editor, which now requires 2 clicks just for inserting application documents, cited docs, or standard clause. I have the feeling that the user experience is not taken into consideration when designing the software.
Slightly negative	I would appreciate to be informed of the changes done when a new version is launched;When I have problems, instead of calling the helpdesk I would appreciate to speak to a person from the trimaran team which could really consider my problem and from which I could may be have a feedback.
Slightly negative	improve the editor!
Slightly negative	Improve the Editor, get rid of the so called 'new philosophy' of prior art documents vs cited documents, give the total overview of the cited passages and all information for the cited docs in ones...we should not have to open allways a new window or menu or register in order to put a small piece of information.
Slightly negative	In general the idea of combining things is ok. However, ergonomically it is a disaster! Clicking non-stop! Too many windows to open and close! If you want to avoid the clicking, there is a alt key possibility. However, many positions are not reachable with the alt key function. The left hand column with application documents, prior art, citations,.. only to mention a few. Moreover, in the new SEA version I cannot understand some of the changes. For example, in Martha that the icons on the top bar to introduce cited documents, standard clauses and the application documents are not there any more (thinks you use for every communication!!!) and that more clicks are necessary to achieve the same. On the other hand, there are icons that we never use (colouring text, ..)
Slightly negative	In general there is too much information on the screen at once.
Slightly negative	It appears to be too complicated and requiring too many clicks in too many to small boxes
Slightly negative	It is often not working and the help of Helpdesk is not satisfactory
Slightly negative	it is slow after clicking, it gives the impresssion thta you have clicked but nothing happen, recurrent buttons are uselessy in hidden menus, useless button are ready visible on the screen. Too many way to do something. It is sufficient to give one way to do a task. Documents to enter 'disastrous'. It takes a real complicated mind to design such an NON-intuitive way of entering amendments

Slightly negative	It's annoying that Trimaran frequenly looses data as far as cited documents (related to Trimaran-Drawer in Viewer), cited passages and DOSYS comments are concerned. The text formatting options of Martha are poor (block mode looks poor, borders between text in italics / bold / normal mode are handled improperly, indenting is weak: e.g. it seems to be not possible to indent a bulleted list). The spelling and grammar checker are not convincing and miss many mistakes.
Slightly negative	Lack of UI guidelines for EPO software development and/or bad UI design cause applications such as Trimaran to lack a learning curve and to be unnecessary complex. New functionality, however, such as for example claim text, fast access to dino and other relevant data is appreciated.
Slightly negative	Learning the softward took time out of my S&E budget (e.g. meaningless icons). It also appears that there is little support because of SPP.
Slightly negative	Martha' is by far the biggest problem, followed by the 'application documents' tab (when you get to deal with several reqests). The rest is fine, so overall only slightly negative.
Slightly negative	Navigation throughout all the menus is rather disturbing
Slightly negative	negative points: ergonomics (two many clicks, bad short keys), user friendliness (like hidden titles, abstract/figures panel, no preview of search report, unecessary multiple printing or search report,...)
Slightly negative	nice functions : easy access to claims, standard clauses, possibility to compare texts word processor is ok ergonomics is poor : too many clicks but the worse is the management of application documents : we only know what we have done by printing the file
Slightly negative	No one would deny that Trimaran offers functionalities that could make our work easier, specially during search. The problem is that, because of the cronical instability, Trimaran creates too many problems (delays) and then the overall performance makes you remember the Caesar old days as better times.
Slightly negative	No real improvement over Caesar/Casex by declined ergonomics.
Slightly negative	No real improvements comparing to previous tools; more difficult to find all the boxes to fill in; therefore more time necessary to write a search report
Slightly negative	Not really an improvement over the old system.
Slightly negative	Odd formating bugs in Martha waste time.
Slightly negative	On the positive side: the split-screen, which provides with a quick overview of different tasks. On the negative side: very slow response which is only overcome by double mouse clicking for almost every event, and causes a lot of fatigue and discomfort in the arms.
Slightly negative	Overall Trimaran is still a product in the beta phase: The editor 'Martha' is not suitable for what it is meant for, it lacks important features (i.e. formatting options) and has tons of bugs. The Trimaran application is complicated to use due to an incredible number of different views, requires many more mouse clicks in comparison to CASEX and CAESAR, it provides very little additional functionality but contains tons of bugs that may sometimes be circumvented by complicated workarounds ...
Slightly negative	Positive: combined functionality of Casex and Caesar. Also easy access to earlier communications. Negative: way too much mouse clicks required that lack the alternative of shortcut keys. Also, in many cases, the clickable area and the button size are so small that the fingers of my mouse hand tense up.
Slightly negative	regarding grants with comments on 2035.3 (not used on a daily basis), slightly embarrassing to follow self-evident clicks and find out that that does NOT work
Slightly negative	slightly negative due to bugs and major deficits in ergonomics
Slightly negative	sluggish, cluttered, not attractive user interface design
Slightly negative	Some interesting improvements which are however counterbalanced by really bad ergonomics and a really really bad text editor.
Slightly negative	spellings check is less

Slightly negative	stability is very good, ergonomics not at all - a lot of clicking, so many fields to fill in, formatting in editor horrible - very cumbersome and unsatisfying
Slightly negative	still too many problems/bugs, and ergonomics still to be improved.
Slightly negative	The 'CASEX' part of Trimaran is much better than anything we had before, however, filling out a search report has become worse in comparison to the 'CEASAR', much more clicking with the mouse, no adjustable window sizes, no drag and drop of documents into the search report anymore, no possibility to arrange windows to the users need, and so and so.
Slightly negative	The citations part is not user friendly, too many clicks for everything. Passage and category are overlapped with the citations themselves, making it difficult to have an overview of the Search report. I do not understand why, after having printed the Search report, if you change something ONLY in the examination part, and make 'send' to activate that change, a new Search report is automatically printed. What a waste of paper !!! I find much better the part of the examination, which is user friendly in general.
Slightly negative	The ergonomic aspects are very poor: Too many clicks, jumping between tabs etc.
Slightly negative	The ergonomic aspects seem to become worse with every actualisation: too many keys to strike for shortcuts (e.g. ALT+0+5+2), changing shortcuts (e.g. to add more passages in cited documents), more clicking (e.g. new bottom 'Insert Text' in Martha only adds clicking!!). I think more attention should be put concerning these aspects.
Slightly negative	The ergonomic issues were not solved and are imo even worse than before. Stability is better
Slightly negative	The idea is good but too many bugs & problems make the overall opinion negative.
Slightly negative	The interface to fill in the Citation details is horrible
Slightly negative	The making of the Search report, especially the treatment of the citations is very cumbersome (too much clicking and not seeing all the info on the screen). In doublures classification should be copied as well. In the new version icons like the introduction of the cited docs are not any more there.
Slightly negative	The menu does reflect the workflow of an application. The add citation button which we have to use a lot is microscopic. The automated sourcing is buggy. Each release, we loose functionalities in Marta which is less powerfull than word for organising the communication and the identations. No possibility of macros.
Slightly negative	The never announced changes result in huge amounts of wasted time looking for how to do things! it is not very user-friendly, although there are some improvements over CAESAR etc.
Slightly negative	The new editor, 'Martha', is horrible. The developers knew the problems from the field tests in advance, but were not willing to help. Moreover, Trimaran as a whole is slow; example: reaction time when klicking buttons.
Slightly negative	The opinion is given keeping in mind that trimaran was supposed to be an improvement of the previous system. Therefore, in that respect there are still too many clickings. Another major drawback is the impossibility to correct and resend an ESOP or WOISA without printing again the search report.
Slightly negative	The software itself is OK (so 'neutral'); however, in view of the horrendous cost of Trimaran, the time needed to get familiar with its functions and the lack of advantages over the old system (which, after a few changes done, could have given us the same functionality), my opinion is slightly negative.
Slightly negative	The Text editor is particularly unsatisfactory. A suitable Spell checker in the three official EPO languages is a must! (and available in any text editors available on the market).
Slightly negative	the worse is the marta editor
Slightly negative	There appears to be no support for this product. Developers resond slowly with fixes. Fundamentally its a good idea but badly implemented (which is probably why you will read lots of answers saying that the product has 'potential')

Slightly negative	There are lots of positives - stability combined funtions BUT there are lots of negatives, the software updates of SEA appear to be going backwards, bugs are not properly fixed , layouts change with no advantage but require more clicks. I am disappointed with the last two release updates for SEA.
Slightly negative	time to start the application is unacceptable, features (F keys etc) gone missing, indentations in the text too complicated and limited. ceasar used to give some warning about the priority clash as soon as a document was entered, here, one needs to check the search report to get a warning message. on the positive side, it seems more stable.
Slightly negative	to concept of doing everything in one program I consider very good, but the ergonomics are TERRIBLE!
Slightly negative	Too little intuitive operating, it should have been listened to the examiners more, if possible...
Slightly negative	too many changes at each new release, too many bugs and users unfriendly ways of working, i.e. difficult to find the routine work ...
Slightly negative	too many clicks; the search report is always printed again when one needs to print again the WOISA or ESOP; the editor cannot be centered on the screen; it is not possible any more to write something under Item IV of the WOISA without providing the division of the inventions in the NU part of the search report (e.g. non-unity in principle but the question of non-unity is postponed).
Slightly negative	Too many ferquent unnecessary changes on the look and feel! Why change the standard clauses with every update? Please leave them standard they do not need frequent changes!
Slightly negative	too many unpredictable bugs and beahviours; too many windows; interface very busy and slightly cumbersome
Slightly negative	Trimaran has a lot of redundancy which request a lot a stress to learn. I see at the end that it was NOT neccessary to spend such time. 1. The left tree is more or less the same than the tabs and sub-tabs on the right top! 2. It took me 2 months to print a search report on white paper and communication on green paper. During all this time, i print all in green (by setting per default green in LAN printer) and paper-copy the search report to white with the Xerox! Why is it not preset as default? 3. Source of cited docs: i have to click on cited doc, click on source, open A windows, click on 'ADD', type the source info (which should be the only action to be done), click for crossing this source, click on OK. EACH click action from the mouse means: take the mouse, search and locate the (small) cursor with my eyes which are then focussed on the cursor, 'move' the cursor to the (small) square to be clicked by means of hand&eyes, and finally left-click. 'SOURCE' is a minor thing for searching and examining a file. But without doing it, i cannot 'send' my application. 4. I would prefer shortcut (accelerator) keys.
Slightly negative	Trimaran is ok and we will get used to it but it has not brought any fundamental improvement in the way we prepared search and communication reports compared with Caesar+Casex. Having the same 'tool' in a different layout costs eventually more time to get accustomed to it.
Slightly negative	Trimaran is slow, it crashes now and again, user friendliness can definitely be improved: bugs are not always solved by new versions of SEA or old repaired bugs re-appear in new versions; The claims of older files are not available and the text of Dutch files is not at all available in Trimaran; Trimaran does not recognize classes of japanese and chinese cited documents; Trimaran shuts down to early in the evening.
Slightly negative	Trimaran: how to bombastically re-invent the wheel thereby ending up with a square-shaped item. Following criticism the square-shaped wheel is reviewed, edges are rasped, the wheel finally becomes almost octagonal and can be declared a success story.
Slightly negative	User interface design is not optimal for the way work is done, e.g. citation panel, citations vs prior art, accessing data of related dossiers (especially for ueuroPCTbis files). Some changes from CAESAR/CASEX for no apparent reason, without distinguishable benefits. Text comparison more often than not not available
Slightly negative	'Veel toeters en bellen', little real improvements
Slightly negative	Very bad text editing software ;-)

Slightly negative	whilst it is admittedly faster, trimaran has a couple of points that are worse: - it is very easy to confuse two different files (you think you work on the one you started but it comes up with an older one...) - it needs more mousework plus more precise mousework ('target areas' very small) - it is not apparent, why all icons in the wordprocessor are 'glued' to the left side or have to be 'summarized' under one item (i.e. 'insert text') whilst half of the toolbar is empty (which would allow you to have more space between the blocks, make them bigger and/or add text...) - the use of standard clauses is slow - formatting (anything else than legal) is cumbersome or uses lots of paper (use of page) - copy and past from viewer into word perfect was better (no unwanted formatting etc included)
Slightly negative	Works slowly, amendments after a first input difficult, problems with the editor for the separate sheet ...
Slightly negative	would have been nice if a survey was organized by trimaran team before impementing user un-friendly modifications...f or exemple acces to standard clauses was direct with one key, and this useful feature is replaced by an unclear menu followed by a key (why do simple when you can make it complicated!) not to mention standard clauses translations...
Slightly positive	I didn't appreciate the last changes in Martha, especially the insert Text option and the fact that we can not customise martha ourselves, for exemple, put the bouton 'insert passages ' in the bar.
Slightly positive	1. I do not like the 'Insert text' button in the version 2.25b, many separate buttons as in version 2.23 were much better, would offer a direct, one-step access of the things to be inserted. 2. The spell-checker of Martha is a tragedy. 3. There are some format things in Martha which I do not understand and not even the Helpdesk could explain to me (see incidents). 4. To list the modifications and their explanations, done by the examining division, in order to grant a patent, is very complicated, absolutely not intuitive. Two years ago it was much more logical and followable. 5. In Viewer the possibility to list the documents to be cited in the Search Report is ok, but I do not like to fill in the pop-up window where I have to define the source, the category and the passages of the document. I should like to do it in another moment, in the list of the documents, not here. 6. The preparation of the Helpdesk-personal is not satisfactory: if I have a problem under Trimaran, the real help comes often in a second instance, couple of days later, although the solution would be needed
Slightly positive	1. The spell correction of Martha does not recognize words that we use in our daily work; proposal: the wording of the legal textes (EPC, PCT and Guidelines) should be recognized by Martha in all 3 languages. 2. The 'ß' should also be available in Martha by typing the shotcut key. At the moment the 'ß' can only be found in the Symbols-area; 3. Related dossiers: not all files (e.g.: FR-files cannot be entered) can be entered in the space prepared for related dossiers in the CRdR
Slightly positive	1. Zeitintensive 2. Es hat lange gedauert, zu entdecken, was hinter jedem Button befindet. Seit einiger Tage sind einige verschwunden (s. standard clauses, cited documents, etc) und wir sind wieder auf der Suche. 3. Einiges ist nicht logisch aufgebaut. Z.B. eine Kollegin versuchte neulich die Zurücknahme eines Hilfsantrags in den appldocs einzutragen. Wir konnten es nicht herausfinden, wie es geht.
Slightly positive	9 months ago I would have answered differently but initial bugs user unfriendly features are slowly being fixed. The question of course is why it took so long since its main purpose is to copy what was already available from Caesar and Casex.
Slightly positive	a lot better than casex but still too many focus bugs, i.e. focus going to places that you don't expect and don't make any sense, and that make working with trimaran rather frustrating...
Slightly positive	A tool should be only released when it is beta-tested. The first version was a catastrophy. Positive points: What is really positive is that the scanned version of the claims is available in all languages and that the standard phrases can be modified and saved quickly. Negative points: There are really too many clicks. And the document transfer from an X-file into the search report is worse than before.
Slightly positive	Actually, I was happier with the first version of Trimaran I used (SEA 2.16). While some improvements have been made with the more recent versions, new bugs have also been introduced (so that quite a lot of bug-fixing is directed to bugs introduced with the previous version), and useful features have been removed (e.g. the right-click 'Table' menu, at least in combination with legal numbering). Promised features often turn out not to work reliably.

Slightly positive	As a WUC I am again and again surprised how many bugs Trimaran still contains. I think proper testing BEFORE roll-out would be the better way rather than using examiners and WUCs as testers. Especially only a minor part of the examiners report bugs, they try rather to find work-arounds. In general Trimaran is considered by many colleagues as overloaded with functionalities. Many would have preferred a more 'sober' software.
Slightly positive	Bad things (to name a few): Too many clicking. Too many windows. Too many confirmation windows. Too many info to be filled. I have the filling that I spend the same amount of time filling up all the info in Trimaran that I spend doing a search. To cite the category and passages of a document in the Search Report (Citations), one has to open (2) hiden windows: it makes no sence. There's no paper format output representation of the data that we introduce, it is not clear where all that info will be printed out. Good things: Having all the info for writing the communication at a 'click distance': importing, cited docs, application claims, passages, Standard Clauses (sing. & plur.), better 'copy&paste' integration. But actually what makes Trimaran usable is the 'Check action' window which not only reports the problems/errors but provides an 'hyper link' that (after clicking on it) opens the window to which the problem refers to. This way you go directly to the problem and solve it without having to think and search for
Slightly positive	better for stability and overall examination procedure worse for search report poor ergonomy (clics)
Slightly positive	Better have no spell checker as the one from Martha !
Slightly positive	Compared to CASEX TRIMARAN is a gain, however the failure time due to newly occured errors (e.g. during deployment of new version) is too long.
Slightly positive	Considering the dimension of the redesign of that toolset and dimension of the project, I think it went fairly well, and the bug fixes are addresses fairly well. However, it is not at all so as our managers and higher management try to present the change to Trimaran (that it would go all smooth and that the alloted training budget would be well enough for examiners to get familiar with the new tool, and that with the new tool work would be much easier - and therefore faster, immediately upon the switch...). In particular, I have experienced several bugs which either I reported as the first, or which have already been known, and were clearly in need of getting fixed, which took me considerable time to find them, together with the debug team, and to work around them until they were eventually fixed (with the next SEA release, some weeks later). Moreover, the new Trimaran tool asks (and this is continuing into all future) from the examiners more effort and work in particular in setting up the citations: Now (new), for each X-citation, regarding each claim
Slightly positive	Das Textverarbeitungsprogramm ist nicht zufriedenstellend. Vor allem fehlt eine Funktion zum Erstellen von Absätzen die der F7 Taste in Wordperfect entspricht. Auch die Eingabe von Dokumenten bei mehreren Hilfsanträgen ist verbesserungswürdig.
Slightly positive	die anleitung oder das kursmaterial ist sehr unübersichtlich und es gibt keine gescheide inhaltverzeichnis. ausserdem ist das layout des programms so dass man schlecht die sachen die man braucht, findet, es wäre gut mit etwas farbe. mindestens für uns alten, die lange mit caesar und co gearbeitet haben. ansonsten gibt es positives da die textverarbeitung etwas einfacher ist. es gibt aber probleme, auf die ich jetzt, direkt nach dem urlaub nicht besinnen kann.
Slightly positive	Die Eingabe von Hilfsanträgen, etwa bei Einsprüchen, ist der Horror. Ich kann mir nicht vorstellen, dass man das nicht einfacher lösen kann. Es scheint mir auch, dass die Stabilität des Systems in letzter Zeit deutlich abgenommen hat (z.T. stundenlange Stillstände).
Slightly positive	Due to the (very) high amount of options to attach comments, notes, whatever, to a file dossier at various levels, the application is confusing and a great exercise in 'button-clicking'. Less is better!
Slightly positive	Ergonomically optimized for the people using keyboard-shortcuts, but not for those preferring a mouse (consequence: to much mouse-clicks necessary for many actions and thus RSI)
Slightly positive	Ergonomics is still not satisfactory. I feel like a pilot in a Boeing cockpit with 1000 switches. Essential/often used features are not grouped together, but distributed in many tabs/rows/tables. Navigation between them is cumbersome. Navigation using one/two keys (e.g. tab nad/or arrows) is often not possible, each table uses other keys and one is tempted to use the mouse too often. But the editor is more stable than WP was.

Slightly positive	for all the time invested in training etc development i cannot really see that leap forward in our every day work (compared with the previous tools)
Slightly positive	General stability is ok/better than Caesar/Casex. Disturbing: 1.communications cannot be printed in green on the Lan printers (although green drawer is selected, they still print on white). 2.when fosa requests new send, also a new SR is printed (waste of paper) 3.very often, buttons don't react the first time they're clicked on, so the ergonomic improvement wrt Caesar/Casex I really don't see. 4.Martha: after a while standard clauses are not inserted anymore, Trimaran-windows have to be closed and opened to work properly again.
Slightly positive	Has potential, but is still somewhat cumbersome to use, e.g. needing a couple of clicks to much to be really ergonomic.
Slightly positive	I don't find Trimaran really stable (I already had a lot of database corruption) and sometimes it is a nightmare to work with it because it is really slow....
Slightly positive	I don't like 'Martha'
Slightly positive	I find it extremely unfortunate that with the latest update, the shortcut keys have been altered. First, we are recommended to learn them all by heart to avoid mouse use and and then, without a warning, they are all changed and I am back to mouse use, totally annoyed (this regards especially the Martha editor, where the shortcut keys used to be the same always, the rest of Trimaran, with changing shortcut keys all the time is so stupid that I always use the mouse and I know others do as well...). Huge bug. Now I won't learn the new ones because they will just be changed again with the next version. These means a huge amount of clicks and mouse use and I can say that only after two weeks using the new version, my right hand hurts already...
Slightly positive	I find the design of the application largely ignores well established ergonomics standards usually followed within the industry.
Slightly positive	I know a number of our colleagues spent a lot of time and effort developing Trimaran, so I am reluctant to criticise too heavily, but I don't find it particularly easy to use for compiling a search report.
Slightly positive	I like the combination of search report and communications in one tool. What I don't like is the ergonomics of the tool. Too many mouse clicks and many of them have to be too precise.
Slightly positive	i like the integration of tools, but i think the software is not mature.
Slightly positive	I really appreciate the 'evolution' of Trimaran: the initial official release I was not happy with, while I'm fine with the latest release. However, Martha still needs much more improvement...
Slightly positive	I would like that we are informed of the changes in the new trimaran versions rather than just having to face them without previous information, and it would be useful to have someone which collects all the request and suggestions from the examiners to really improve the new versions.
Slightly positive	improvements needed in response time
Slightly positive	In general Trimaran has improved since its introduction.
Slightly positive	In the latest version it has been a change that I consider a step back. To open the window for inserting standard clausses now I need an extra click. Apart from being annoying, it is bad for my RSI
Slightly positive	integrating ceasara and casex and viewer was a good idea; though, many details would need improvement
Slightly positive	interface got more 'unreadable' (in comparison to CSR/CSX) and is changing too often w/o visible grounds (e.g. drop down menu instead of single buttons in the editor w/ version 2.25); support for basics is still missing (search, copy of combined action when working on doublures, ...); stability increased a lot in comparison to CSR/CSX.
Slightly positive	It could be better, and more user-friendly
Slightly positive	It is a pity it could have been some much more efficient and user friendly. I have a feeling like the strucure and input has come too much from outside the EPO. Though the basic idea is very good but not yet very well implemented. It is a first step.

Slightly positive	It is a step in the right direction for sure. But there is still a long way to go concerning the ergonomic structure. First of all the Java engine in itself has a very funny behaviour as it is different from the general Windows behaviour when it comes to clicking and selection functions. Then of course the overwelming 'attack' of information that strikes you when you open Trimaran is a problem which slows down the work. It is very difficult to keep an overview. As a last point I find it very funny that they didn't manage to remove the square user functions and pitfalls of Caesar. Citing documents is still too complecated. Even writing a search report 'by hand' e.g. in Word would be easier. The editor Martha could be much better, at least accroding to standards of modern editors. The various checking functions are good and actually save Trimaran. I have a slight feeling that the technical (software) skill of those who designed Trimaran is less than adequate for the task. Thanks for your effort!
Slightly positive	It is an improvement over the 'old' split CASEX/CAESAR processing software but there's certainly lots of work to be done yet. For instance: why not provide a 'Send'-Button / functionality within search reports WITHOUT printing a new SR version - would be useful when changes were made only in the ESOP / WOISA or in the respective forms ?
Slightly positive	It is by far better than Caesar/Casex. However, this is not a finished product, it is just the base to start improving it. With respect to the state of the art in SW development, Trimaran is still 10 years behind.
Slightly positive	It is difficult to enter the citations, it would be better if we can have category, passages and so on at one glance without nedd to click on each one to fill in.
Slightly positive	It is reacting very slow (probably due to the use of Java).
Slightly positive	It provides one tool to process files, but it is much to buggy and the user-interface has been designed without asking examiners what they need.
Slightly positive	it still needs a lot of improvement, but I think the concept is positive
Slightly positive	It's kinda OK, but it takes quite some time to get to relearn all the moves; The support from helpdesk is, fortunately very good, so in case one gets stuck, the helpdesk guys are very good at helping people out....
Slightly positive	last update with the button 'insert text' is a nonsense: all useful buttons are known hidden and need one more click to be accessed....
Slightly positive	Main problem ergonomics
Slightly positive	Main problem is the number of clicks to open/close the (too many) screens. You get too easily lost in all those screens. And too many too small buttons.
Slightly positive	'Marta' Editor needs still to be improved: e.j. Grammar checking needs to be incorporated.
Slightly positive	Martha text processing programme has a too long delay time.
Slightly positive	Martha's speed remains a problem
Slightly positive	misses editor for math equation
Slightly positive	more clicking than before.
Slightly positive	Much better Caesar and Word Perfect! However, the citations window should be splittable between Left and Right, the spell checker is a mess.
Slightly positive	My overall impression is quite good; however the Martha editor is unsatisfactory to work with, as many features that are today's standard in text processing are missing.
Slightly positive	No easy copy function for files to set up doublures -Citations: Journals imported via External are always given as both serial AND book, they should be recognized as serial only.

Slightly positive	No page lay out, that means heading on the bottom of the page and for small corrections the whole document has to be reprinted. Would be nice to enter the dossier comments in the text document in the same manner as appl. docs and citations. Non-patent literature complicated; system always sets back to abstract in the viewer, unless an XP number is present. But nice to have the parallel windows.
Slightly positive	No real improvement over Casex+Caesar. Slightly more stable, but no more user friendly.
Slightly positive	Non-Unity PCT after payment of further invetions (final): it should be possible to open the first WOISA and modify it without having to do a new onw. -There should be an icon informing of the state of an action: printed, sent, not-sent.
Slightly positive	Not really user friendly: too many clicks required at all time increase in RSI is to be expected!!!
Slightly positive	often too slow, particularly when more than one instance is running. Extremely slow, when copying dossier contents to another dossier
Slightly positive	one very bad point: too many clicks are necessary, not good for ergonomics
Slightly positive	Overall, Trimaran is an improvement when compared to the old Ceasar/Casex. I still don't understand why they had to reinvent the wheel when they cobbled together Martha... (There are plenty of high quality open source editors available that actually work.)
Slightly positive	PB1:Fonctionne lentement, PB2: lors du dernier changement supression en accès direct à de nombreuses fontions dans l'éditeur de texte. De plus ce sont les fonctions qui servent le plus
Slightly positive	please stop changing each time you put a new version the way the 'open file' reacts (in a new window or in the same window), it is very disturbing, chose one and stick to it. Likewise, I don't really get why in the expanded version of the Marta editor all the buttons to add standards clauses, NU reasoning and application documents have been collapsed under one single button: there is a lot of space to expand all those buttons and the collapsed version is making me loose time.
Slightly positive	Poor editor program (Martha).
Slightly positive	Positive is all sort of aspects except in ergonomics/user friendliness; orthographic correction in martha is also a disaster.
Slightly positive	Positive points: parallel work on SR and ESOP/WOISA integration of word processing programme highlighting of typos quite intuitive Trimaran cupboard/highlighting Negative points: Entered data which disappears and has to be reentered no separate send and print of SR and Search opinion sometines a bit unstable
Slightly positive	Reaction to user commands sometimes slow. Some parts of the user interface are cumbersome and not ergonomic , most of all the entering of citations/sources. Despite these problems, Trimaran is definitively an improvement compared to Casex/Caesar.
Slightly positive	relatively OK but not very intuitive when I need to do occasional extra tasks
Slightly positive	Response time is too high, ergonomics do not exist, and marta is a mess!!! But the general approach to have one application for all purposes is good.
Slightly positive	Some actions are not intuitive. Changes to Application documents do not automatically percollate through to actions, etc.
Slightly positive	Speed is sometimes unacceptable. Functionality could be improved sometimes. Shourtcuts don't work as one would expect.
Slightly positive	still many bugs and handling not convenient, too many clicks and just an unfortunate layout. Most amazing that examiners were involved!!!!!
Slightly positive	switching from one action to another is still very slow.
Slightly positive	Text editor: I lose time trying to fix paragraph indents and numbering.
Slightly positive	The amount of clicking has increased. Trimaran is better. However the quetion is if it could have been further improved. I think it could, for example avoiding extra clicking and so many tabs...

Slightly positive	The basic planning is good; one can notice there are a lot of good ideas taken into consideration in order to support the examiner's work. However, in my opinion, the stability should be increased and the down times sensibly decreased
Slightly positive	The citation page still needs some work, it is not very practical (it was better with Caesar...) - In general Trimaran is still too slow.
Slightly positive	The constant changes to the layout make users loose a lot of time (example: once one was used to the icons in the Martha editor, they were removed and put into a drop-down-menu).
Slightly positive	The Editor is better than what I feared and Trimaran has some useful functions like the connections with the Viewer. Very bad is however the interface for entering bibliographical and citation data for the search report.
Slightly positive	The editor is the only problem left, otherwise Positive.
Slightly positive	The gain of time is minimal: -the main gain is when it is not needed to repeat the list of claims in the cover of the PCT applications the main advantage are the short cuts to reduce mouse work, although this implies a slight lost of time
Slightly positive	The interaction of the search and examination elements is undeniably better than it was with the old Caesar/Casex combination. The bugs, especially in the text editor, are infuriating, however.
Slightly positive	The lack of an equation editor is a MAJOR DEFICIENCY of our new software setup
Slightly positive	The search part is not ergonomic. Too many clicks. The old interface was far better for search. The part of examination on the contrary is better than old CASEX.
Slightly positive	The standard clause function needs improvement (window disapears using the "insert" button)
Slightly positive	The text tool WP whatever is nota s flexible as the old CASEX system, I sitll have great difficulties amending Druckexemplar, and commenting these amandments. In the search report, I still have not understood where the D-docs are, when I loasd an X-file into the prior art, they simply disappear from the x-file
Slightly positive	There are a few good features, but still much work needs to be done, in particular in making the program much more self-explanatory and straight forward to use. Often hours are spent trying to figure out how to do something correctly or trying to figure out what somebody did wrong. Why are tickboxes and other clickable areas small when there is space to make them big? And please: can we have a real editor with hanging indents?
Slightly positive	There are some aspects to be ameliorate, for ex.: import to Ross, copy and paste from external Work files (actually not possible), copy and paste between different fields inside the Trimaran window.
Slightly positive	There are still bugs to be corrected.
Slightly positive	There are still too many bugs and Helpdesk takes too long to come up with solutions. The concept is better than CAESAR and CASEX alone but there is still lots of room for improvement.
Slightly positive	There is a need for a better spell check and better tabulation. It is not possible to establish a link between an older WL in viewer and an old dossier open now in Trimaran.
Slightly positive	There is still large room for improvement
Slightly positive	To fill in the fields in the Citations window is a catastrophy: too much pop-up windows, low resolution, i.e. large characters response time is low;
Slightly positive	Too many bugs; newer versions bring often additional problems and new bugs; Marta still lacking as adequate word-processor esp. spell checker and quick correct; often difficulties with certain abstract types; loading times often excessively slow
Slightly positive	too many clicks..
Slightly positive	Too many icons/buttons to click, and - Missing the old-good Caesar interface (Search Report seen as when printed) - (Too) many yellow stickers...
Slightly positive	too many windows, still a lot of bugs

Slightly positive	Trimaran is definitely better than CASEX/CAESAR but too slow and has seriously annoying bugs in Martha
Slightly positive	Trimaran is no doubt better than casex etc... but still needs some improvements in ergonomics, in particular the short-cuts.
Slightly positive	Trimaran's strongest point is that its predecessors were so much worse. While the organisation of the workflow is already pretty good, getting in the details (prior art, citations, etc.) is still too much point-and-click; keyboard navigation is a pain.
Slightly positive	Very bad implementation of Marta-Editor: if comm. are more that 3 pages, it becomes very slowly and it is nearly impossible to write texts quickly
Slightly positive	Very good intention of the developers, in principle good features, implementation could have been better. Too many updates that improve one aspect but introduce two more bugs. Very time consuming for examiners to get familier with an updated version. New release notes are unreadable (who shall read trough 150 bug fixes and who would assume that a launched version suffers from so many??).
Slightly positive	Very slow (expected for Java), better than Casex/Caesar, but the interface is a bit cluttered and the shortcuts/accelerator keys could be better. Being able to customise the word editor further would be a great help - perhaps addition of own shortcut buttons? Also, the auto text correction, which i used for adding set phrases in wordperfect does not work well (cursor jumps to start of phrase, so cannot type fluidly).
Slightly positive	We should have the course again, after using it for a while. I'm not using more features than in casex.
Slightly positive	We used to have a fantastic text editor, WordPerfect, that was often criticised for being old fashioned. However, it allowed us to do everything we needed. As far as I am concerned, with Martha we returned to the Middle Ages in terms text editing. What I miss in particular is the F7 function and the liberty to create own tabs, margins and indents. Kind regards,
Slightly positive	What was promised, the immediate coding of any action, in particular search actions, is not there.
Very negative	A lot more mouse work / clicks is necessary
Very negative	a desaster! Too many buttons, unclear icons, very user unfriendly
Very negative	a useless modification. casex was already ok... there was no need to replace casex with another program.
Very negative	Already the very basis functions of an editor (cut, copy, paste) of Trimaran/Marta are a daily pain !
Very negative	Amateur software. A real shame
Very negative	An absolute shame
Very negative	awful ergonomics, bad overview of citations - if you have more than one it is hidden, confusing layout, strange position of buttons, bad error messages, no labels on buttons, time consuming, strange machine pauses (for saving?) during typing, a failure at all these things - but with a little help by my friends and Wucs it will eventually produce the documents I ask for
Very negative	Ceasar and Casex were superior in almost all respects and furthermore looked professional not like a programme written in a bedroom by a post doc student. The format should be clearer, the programme faster, the text thicker and more distinct, cut out too many useless options, still has too many bugs i.e text dissapearing amongst many others, more user friendly -the screen can not be set up how the user needs, the boxes are too small or too large. What a waste of public money and time! It should be removed tomorrow and Ceaser and Casex reverted too. Nobody can say word perfect was not a tried and tested editor, Marther is inferior in all respects. No figures have been provided of any cost saving, in fact all pointers seem to indicate overall it has cost more and employed more people at all levels.
Very negative	Comparing to Casex, the only advantage is the stability, less crashes. But overall it is a very HEAVY time consuming system.
Very negative	Cumbersome interface: superfluous message boxes, multiple clicks required to activate item, illogical organisation of tasks, shortcuts don't always work, no buttons for frequently used tasks, working area normally too small. Instability: slow response time, program freezes often

Very negative	ergonomic disaster e.g. putting a citation source requires from 5 to 7 mouse clicks
Very negative	Ergonomics are GRUESOME, many things are extremely awkward to do, the constant popping in and out of minuscule little windows is extremely confusing, the editor is gruesome, the 'undo' function of the editor randomly deletes text, and some functions of the editor are only accessible in the fullscreen view, some only in the embedded view (bad!). No way to see the actual search report (WYSIWYG). The only positive thing is the somewhat better integration of the functions of former Casex and Caesar. Otherwise, a complete mess.
Very negative	Ergonomics is a catastrophy Response time in Martha is slow, was better, slowing down again Software does not follow the standard desing principles of modern programmes you nerver get what you expect Every new release takes the system down for at least a couple of hours Every new release introduces new bugs Briefly: I have never seen anything worse in a professional environment
Very negative	ergonomics poor (too many mouse clicks needed, to much reshaping of window size needed to get appropriate input field size, to many changes of windows (window focus needed) technology is a step back compared to before and does not included well known standards(no wysiwyg especially in the search report, awkward presentation and separation of data in different areas like citations and prior art not linked to the search report, furthermore titles, classes in separated different, citation, category, passage separated in different windows) fuctions poor in particular in the editor martha (only rudimental functions for text formating, no formula editor), text comparison is a complete joke and any shareware tool is better in particular wordino! the effort spend on a dossier has increased just due to the use of trimaran and trimaran is frustrating in particular the perspective that in the end we have to live with such a unprofessional low standard tool for years and even worser this will be accompanied by regularly statements from IT and
Very negative	far too complex and not enough on-line user friendly help
Very negative	far too many different input fields (location), means extensive mouse-positioning work .... bad ergonomics .. too many windows overlapping more or less obviously; difficult and non-logic to maneuover your way through even a standard file .
Very negative	Horrible as far as ergonomics are concernned.
Very negative	Horrible interface, extremely slow and cumbersome. Ridicoulosly heavy for what it does. Word processor is a joke and the GUI for inserting Prior Art is simply awful. All in all a disgrace.
Very negative	I am fed up with the small thinks which never never work because fo forgot to do some specique actions, and therefore examiner waisting their time in searching searching to understand how to correct some 'bull shit' errors
Very negative	I am unable to see any advantages of this 'unified suite' of applications. Each step requires more time than in the past. Several bugs have been already detected by myself and others. I cannot see any positive advantages/costs ratio.
Very negative	I don't know where to start with the complaints, but I think a source of many Trimaran defects is that the develpoers don't have enough time and manpower to produce a satifactory version of TrimaRAN
Very negative	I hate it, after +/- 10 months I am still not used to it and find it very awkward to use. Definitely not an improvement.
Very negative	I spend my life writing letters - every day I pray for a decent text editor
Very negative	Im Vergleich zu früher: Wesentlich mehr Mausaktionen nötig; sehr schlechte 'usability', besonders kleine Icons, keine intuitive Benutzerführung, 95% der Informationm am Startbildschirm ist Informationsmülll (bspw.: Adresse Inventor letztes Beispiel: Hülsewede!, Albanien wurde auf als Bestimmungsland genannt; wer will das wissen? es gibt doch RegisterPlus; diese Nachteile sind in der ein oder anderen Weise über das gesamte Programm verteilt!). Ein solches Programm sollte funktionieren wie ein iPod/iPhone. Tut es aber nicht!Falls 'wir' (das Amt) das am Markt verkaufen müssten: würde es jdm. kaufen wollen??? Verantworltiche sollten erkennen, dass die Zukunft NICHT mittels grösserer Komplexität gemeistert wird!!! Danke!

Very negative	Intricated tool , even less user friendly than previous tools, absolute anti ergonomic, why isn't what we seen on screen simply what we print&sent to Applicants ?
Very negative	Introducing the 'cited documents' takes about 100 mouse-clicks.
Very negative	It is a scandal. 1. Bad reliability: For myself, I estimate that Trimaran will reduce the production for 2010 with at least 5%. It will probably mean a production loss for the EPO in total in the order of 3-5%. Trimaran should have been tested much longer before it was rolled out. Now everybody is losing time because it doesn't work properly. 2. Wrong concept: Trimaran is so akward in its consept, that the overwiev is lost. When compared with the end products (search reports, communications, etc.), Trimaran is just too complicated (Caesar also was). 3. Summary: Trimaran is not a tool that helps getting the work done. It is an obstacle. Too much time is spent fighting against Trimaran. Les and les time is available for the real work. 4. EPO management: How is it possible that someone puts so lousy software in operation? The persons responsible should not be allowed to take any decisions concerning software in the future.
Very negative	It is horror, horror, and once again horror. Why standard Windows features were abolished and one had to create something entirely new?
Very negative	It is very user-unfriendly. Most of all: 'Marta' is a pain in the as.
Very negative	It takes far to long to start! Absolutely no ergonomic layout! 30% of communications lost between me and my support staff!!!! Trimaran is rubbish!
Very negative	It's a nightmare!
Very negative	It's not really pratical, it often bugs, some things are really difficult or even impossible to do. I do not like it at all.
Very negative	Many annoying errors. Slow. Certainly decreased my productivity overall!
Very negative	Martha is a horrible editor. The spell checker is unreliable. Formatting is difficult. It is very frustrating that the Martha editor gets closed automatically when the user moves back to the citation editor of Trimaran. Surely the point of Trimaran is to enable us to work seamlessly on citations and communications.
Very negative	MARTHA should be urgently substituted by a modern state-of-the-art text processor. I recommend taking www.openoffice.org. The behavior of the windows of the trimaran graphical user interface is awful. The windows overlap, move and behave strangely. This distracts a lot and does not allow to work efficiently. It is needed to click a lot of elements in order to access all the needed information for creating a search or examination action. In summary, a big desaster. The Graphical User Interface is not designed to be efficient and ergonomically sound.
Very negative	No way to find out how things work without help within a reasonable time. Lacking intuitivity
Very negative	One of the worst software application I had the bad luck to use.
Very negative	overdesigned (clicking is not my favourite activity); stupid editor; CAESOR form filling still horrible (there is a life outside patent documents).
Very negative	Response time is very poor.
Very negative	slow, complicated to use, too many mouse clicks required, not logically structured, not adapted to the real work of a patent examiner
Very negative	Spent a lot of money for no added functionality, actually making the task less transparent, which could have been spent usefully. For instance in the Viewer for creating pop-ups for showing the discription of references in drawings.
Very negative	Tends to forget previous entries. You have to do your work over and over. The application is definitly unstable.

Very negative	The design of Trimaran is totally illogical and no improvement over CAESAR and CASEX. All the EPO had to do was sort out the WORDPERFECT bug (by integrating WORD perhaps) instead a monster has been created. The screens in Trimaran are overloaded with information and buttons are hidden away. Instead of adapting a tool to the core tasks we now adapt the core tasks to the tool. Screen layout and information input are a juggling exercise. Martha, although an improvement on the bugged Word Perfect also now has its own bugs (spell checker unreliable, cut and paste was not working on occasiosn, text input was also being delayed at one point. Trimaran should have got a thumbs down from the Cellules de suivi.
Very negative	The ergonomics are a disaster, the 'help' provided laughable and, sometimes, incomprehensible. Quite honestly, Caesar and Casex, for all their faults, were easier to use and much more stable.
Very negative	The sole and only advantage of Trimaran is that it makes both Caesar and Casex appearing wonderful by contrast ... tells a lot ...
Very negative	The system may be 'clever', but it is certainly not user-friendly ! Bring back the old systems, which were easier to operate - also Trimaran has been clearly written by a computer geek without examiner (of average ability) involvement - ie. an examiner who is not a computer whizz-kid.....
Very negative	The text editor martha is really bad: very poor spell checker, very poor short cuts, bad layout, unstable etc.
Very negative	The Trimarin window is complete chaos. Input of citations is much more time consuming than in the past due to the huge amount of input fields squashed into a half a page. The incessant dissappearance of Martha (the editor) is frustrating. An ergonomic catastrophy
Very negative	There is more time needed to fill the forms out than the real examination. TAKE IT BACK IMMEDIATELY. POISON FOR Repetitive Strain Injury
Very negative	Too much clicking with the mouse, a very unstable wordprocessor (marta), overloaded with functions, muc lack of a logical workflow
Very negative	Too much clicking, icons too small. Risk for developing/worsening RSI symptoms definitely augmented.
Very negative	Trimaran is a real existing obstacle for those who want to work efficiently and sometimes - with pleasure !!
Very negative	Trimaran was *clearly* not designed by people who *actually* treat files. It is not-at-all intuitive. It is an 'RSI machine'.
Very negative	Un désastre à tout niveau !
Very negative	User friendliness and ergonomics fall short of current industry standards in the field of human-computer interaction - number of clicks a user has to performed has increased radically which is bound to translate into increased prevalence of upper limb disorded within a couple of years. Response times are ridiculous and have resulted in expressions suchs as 'trimaran - when in doubt, click three times' and 'when you click something in trimaran, you also have to mean it'. Disappointing and depressing.
Very negative	very slow due to network (takes minutes to start),unstable, many clicks,user-unfriendly interface
Very negative	When Caesar and Casex were still in use, as replies to complaints or error reporting, it was always promised that Trimaran would remedy these issues and no action was taken at that time. Now it turned out that (possibly) some bugs were indeed remedied but many others created, so that summa summarum no improvement occurred!
Very negative	Wirklich Scheisse !
Very negative	zu kompliziert, nicht ergonomisch, unübersichtlich, erhöhter Zeitaufwand, Sonderfälle wie several requests sind ein Alptraum zum ausfüllen,....
Very positive	- the search report should not be printed out automatically every time we send it (paper wastage!)
Very positive	* Feedback about newest version of the Martha editor: In the new version of the editor Martha we need 2 clicks to insert standard clauses, documents cited in SR, citOCRed claims, etc. whereas in the previous version that could be done in just 1 click.
Very positive	A big step forward from Caesar and Casex.
Very positive	A lot of additional clicks .....

Very positive	Almost anything is better than ancient WordPerfect and buggy Caesar+Casex. Trimaram is not perfect but definitely better that what we had before.
Very positive	Any retyping should be prevented. Like the date of the letters from the applicant or any information in the file which has been added to the file in DINO by the receiving section or other departments.
Very positive	Better integration of the passages cited (textually with the blue marker) into Martha is possible.
Very positive	Even taking into account that my actions seem to get lost the odd time, it's a major step in the right direction.
Very positive	Far better
Very positive	Go on like this! ;-)
Very positive	Great improvement with respect to previous mess!
Very positive	I am not sure as to the reasons behind this survey. Very suspect. But for what it's worth, Trimaran is great.
Very positive	I do not think any valuable survey should consist of a single question.
Very positive	I was part of the first group of examiners office wide to have Trimaran rolled out. I also work as SEA (trimaran) tester.
Very positive	I wish no more changes would be made for the next year.
Very positive	It is really better than everything we had yet. Sure it is not perfect, but it definitly goes into the right direction!
Very positive	Like it very much. Only the look is not very nice and our screen should be much bigger.
Very positive	much better than CAESAR/CASEX
Very positive	Much, much, very much better than the combination Caesar, Casex and WordPerfect.
Very positive	Not so nice: the many bugs. But what I like: ERGONOMY ! I have the impression that trimaran-people cared so that examiners have a useful and pleasant tool. Possibly trimaran suffers because the overall computer environment of the office is a botched-up patchwork.
Very positive	Overall I consider it a big step forward. I am very thankful to have been rescued from Word Perfect and the consistent data storage for one application beats CAESAR / CASEX by far. There might be small issues as in any new SW tool, but it seems that they are resolved step by step. Best regards - a TRIMARAN fan
Very positive	Some of my pet issues (bête noires) will be solved in SEA2.27 (citations pane), so my outlook is positive.
Very positive	still not perfect, but a big step forward!
Very positive	There are many functionalities I do not use because it does not fit with my working style, but so what ? - it is nice to see real thought going into software. I would like to see Trimaran suit those people who write the ESOP / WOISA first and then make the search report, for whom no real efficiency savings have occured. The most important helpful thing is the standard clause suff being nicer to use. Horrible is having to click on boxes in order to expose the fields to be filled in the search report. Why does the printout not work - often words lose their spaces !!!
Very positive	There are still outstanding issues. Hence, the Trimaran-team should get all the support (and personel) needed.
Very positive	This is a vast improvement as Trimaran allows the development of the strategy rather than having to repeat steps.
Very positive	time spent to adjust was however very big
Very positive	Trimaran helps us to reduce our productivity. The enormous number of mouse clicks gives us time to think about our actions. Quality is much improved, since quick and easy grants are impossible with Trimaran. With the introduction of Trimaran, the management clearly gave the sign that the 'mentality of more and more' is over now. Congratulations!
Very positive	very user-friendly!

Very positive	when I rank it as 'very positive', this does not mean that it's perfect; because we are living in an evolving world, this tool has to chang/improve further and never will be finished and perfect. Nevertheless, I like it much more than the former tools and I like to work with it.
	I started to use Trimaran 2 weeks ago, thus I do not feel like expressing an opinion about it
	I have given no answer because I don't believe that such a superficial question can provide any useful information. If you want to do a survey on user satisfaction with Trimaran, do it properly.