

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MONOSOL RX, LLC
Petitioner

v.

ICOS CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2017-00412

Patent 6,943,166

**EXPERT DECLARATION OF ROGER WILLIAMS, M.D.
REGARDING U.S. PATENT NO. 6,943,166**

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK	3
II.	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	4
III.	BASIS FOR OPINION	6
IV.	THE FIELD OF PDE5 INHIBITORS FOR TREATING SEXUAL DYSFUNCTION	7
V.	THE LAW OF ANTICIPATION AND OBVIOUSNESS	11
VI.	THE '166 PATENT	15
A.	Specification and Admitted State of the Art	16
B.	Prosecution History	18
VII.	INTERPRETATION OF THE '166 CLAIMS AT ISSUE	28
A.	About 1 to about 20 mg	28
B.	Up to a maximum total dose of 20 mg per day	29
C.	Compound having the structure	32
VIII.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	33
IX.	THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART	33
A.	U.S. Patent 5,859,006 (“Daugan ‘006”)	33
B.	PCT Application Daugan '675	34
C.	U.S. Patent No. 6,140,329 (“Daugan ‘329”)	35
D.	Petition to Add Information	37
E.	Known Adverse Effects of PDE5 Inhibitors	37
F.	Market Need for Effective Drug at Lower Doses	38
G.	Routine Optimization	39
X.	ANALYSIS OF THE PRIOR ART	42
A.	Claims 1-12 Are Obvious § 103(a) Over At Least Daugan ‘675	42
B.	Obvious to Try the Claimed Range	63

C. Motivation to Use the Lower the Dose..... 66

D. Reasonable Expectation of Success for the Lower Dose 71

E. No “Unexpected” Results 72

XI. CONCLUSION..... 77

I, Roger Williams, M.D., hereby declare and state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK

1. My name is Roger Williams, M.D. I have been asked to provide my opinions by Petitioner MonoSol RX, LLC in this *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) as an expert in the relevant art.

2. I have been asked to provide my opinions and views on the materials I have reviewed in this IPR related to U.S. Patent No. 6,943,166 (the “‘166 patent”) (Ex. 1001), and the scientific and technical knowledge regarding the same subject matter. I have been asked to consider what one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood from the ‘166 patent. I have also considered whether certain references disclose or suggest the features recited in the claims of the ‘166 patent. My opinions are set forth below.

3. My opinions are guided by my appreciation of how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the claims of the ‘166 patent at the time of the alleged invention, which I have been asked to initially assume is April 30, 1999, the earliest filing date potentially attributable to the ‘166 patent.

4. Based on my experience and expertise it is my opinion that certain references as discussed in detail below alone or in combination disclose or suggest all the features recited in the claims of the ‘166 patent, that any differences from these prior references are obvious, and that these claims combine well known

features to provide predictable results. Attached as Appendix A to this report is a detailed chart showing where each claim limitation is disclosed in the prior art.

II. PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

5. I earned a B.A. in Chemistry and Zoology from Oberlin College, and an M.D. from the University of Chicago School of Medicine 1967. I was Board Certified in Internal Medicine in 1972 and Board Certified in Clinical Pharmacology in 1991. From 2000 to 2014, I was the CEO and Chair, Council of Experts of the United States Pharmacopeial Convention (USP). From 1995 to 2000, I was the Deputy Center Director for the Office of Pharmaceutical Science (CDER) at the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). I am currently an expert consultant and partner at NDA Partners, LLC.

6. I have taught courses in Introductory Pharmacokinetics, Pharmacokinetics for Pharmaceutical Students, Pharmacology, Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, and Clinical Drug Investigations.

7. I am or have been a member of the American Medical Association, the American Society of Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the International Pharmaceutical Federation.

8. With respect to the subject matter at issue in this IPR, I have extensive experience. I have coordinated and participated more than 100 clinical and related

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.