


Exhibit E of Schiffman Declaration 1

	Phase 2 001	Phase 3 (1 st study)	Phase 3 (2 nd study)
	0.05% CsA in 0.625% CO	0.05% CsA in 1.25% CO	0.05% CsA in 1.25% CO
	Compared with 0.1% CsA in 1.25% CO		
Improvement in STT	0.25	2 (8-Fold Improvement*)	1 (4-Fold Improvement*)
Decrease in Corneal Staining	0.25	1 (4-Fold Improvement*)	1 (4-Fold Improvement*)


*Compared to the 0.05% CsA/0.625% CO Phase 2 formulation (disclosed in Ding)

Exhibit F of Schiffman Declaration 1



This dramatic increase in relative efficacy between the claimed methods and the formulation disclosed in Examples 1E and 1D of Ding was especially unexpected in view of pharmacokinetic data. As described by Dr. Attar in paragraph 7 of the Attar Declaration, pharmacokinetic studies were performed on animal eyes, which compared the pharmacokinetic properties of several cyclosporin A-containing formulations, including formulations containing 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A and 0.625% by weight castor oil, formulations containing 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil, and formulations containing 0.1% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil. This data was compiled and organized in Exhibit B to the Attar Declaration, reproduced below:

Exhibit B to Attar Declaration



As described in paragraph 7 of the Attar Declaration, this chart shows that the amount of cyclosporin A that reaches the cornea and conjunctiva, ocular tissues that are highly relevant for the treatment of dry eye or keratoconjunctivitis sicca, is higher for the

formulation containing 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A and 0.625% by weight castor oil (Ding 1E) than the formulation containing 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil (the formulation in the claimed methods) relative to the formulation containing 0.1% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil (Ding 1D). According to Dr. Attar, this data teaches that the claimed methods using the formulation containing 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil would be less therapeutically effective than the formulation containing 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A and 0.625% by weight castor oil or the formulation containing 0.10% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil. Attar Declaration at ¶ 8. Similarly, according to Dr. Schiffman, this data shows that, since lower levels of cyclosporin A were reaching the ocular tissues relevant for the treatment of dry eye, one of skill in the art would have expected patients receiving the formulation in the claimed methods to exhibit a lesser decrease from baseline in corneal staining score and a lesser increase from baseline in Schirmer Score relative to the corneal staining scores and Schirmer Scores of the patients receiving the 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A / 0.625% by weight castor oil formulation (Ding 1E) in the Phase 2 trials, as illustrated in Schiffman Declaration 1, Exhibit B. *See* Schiffman Declaration 1 at ¶ 13.

As described by Dr. Schiffman in paragraphs 14-15 of Schiffman Declaration 1, surprisingly, the claimed method was equally or more therapeutically effective for the treatment of dry eye or keratoconjunctivitis sicca than the formulation containing 0.10% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil (Ding 1D) according to corneal staining score, Schirmer Score, an improvement in the common dry eye/keratoconjunctivitis sicca symptom of blurred vision and a greater decrease in the number of artificial tears used by patients.

Taking the results of the studies and data presented in the Attar and Schiffman 1 Declarations together, it is clear that the specific combination of 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A with 1.25% by weight castor oil is surprisingly critical for therapeutic effectiveness in the treatment of dry eye or keratoconjunctivitis sicca.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the Declarations of Drs. Rhett M. Schiffman (Schiffman Declaration 1) and Attar, together with the data presented in those

declarations, provide clear and convincing objective evidence that establishes that the claimed methods, including administration of a formulation with 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil, demonstrate surprising and unexpected results, including improved Schirmer Tear Test scores and corneal staining scores (key objective measures of efficacy for dry eye or keratoconjunctivitis sicca) and improved visual blurring and reduced artificial tear use as compared to the prior art, for example, emulsion formulations disclosed in Ding, including formulations with 0.05% by weight cyclosporin A and 0.625% by weight castor oil (Ding 1E) and formulations with 0.10% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil (Ding 1D).

The Claimed Methods are Commercially Successful

As discussed during the Examiner interview, in addition to having surprising and unexpected results, the claimed methods have demonstrated commercial success. In support of this position, the Applicants submit herewith as Exhibit 3, a Declaration of Aziz Mottiwala under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 (hereinafter, “Mottiwala Declaration”), Vice President of Marketing at Allergan for Allergan’s Dry Eye Product Franchise.

As explained by Mr. Mottiwala, RESTASIS®, which is a commercial embodiment of the claimed methods, has been sold since 2003. *See* Mottiwala Declaration at ¶ 2. Since the launch of RESTASIS® in 2003, worldwide sales of the drug have increased steadily. *See* Mottiwala Declaration at ¶ 3 and Exhibit B to Mottiwala Declaration. Currently, annual world-wide net sales for RESTASIS® are over \$200 million per quarter, and nearing \$800 million annually. *See* Mottiwala Declaration at ¶ 4. This is strong evidence of commercial success. *See Id.* As there is no other FDA-Approved therapeutic treatment for dry eye available on the US market, RESTASIS® owns 100% of the market share. *Id.*

Accordingly, the Applicants assert that the Declaration of Aziz Mottiwala provides objective evidence that unequivocally establishes that the present invention as embodied in RESTASIS® has been met with commercial success.

The Claimed Methods Satisfied a Long-Felt Need

As discussed during the Interview, the claimed methods also resolve a long-felt need for a therapeutic treatment for dry eye or keratoconjunctivitis sicca. In support of this position, the Applicants submit herewith as Exhibit 4, a Declaration of Dr. Rhett M. Schiffman under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 (hereinafter, “Schiffman Declaration 2”).

According to the MPEP, establishing long-felt need requires objective evidence that an art recognized problem existed in the art for a long period of time without solution. *See* MPEP § 716.04.

First, the need must have been a persistent one that was recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art. *Id.* As explained by Dr. Schiffman, dry eye/keratoconjunctivitis sicca has been a known, persistent ocular disorder for many years. Publications on dry eye date back to at least the 1970’s, and interest and publication on the subject has increased substantially since. *See* Schiffman Declaration 2 at ¶¶ 2-4.

Second, the long-felt need must not have been satisfied by another before the invention by applicant. MPEP 716.04. As explained by Dr. Schiffman, no other therapeutic dry-eye drug has been approved by the FDA before or since RESTASIS®. *See* Schiffman Declaration 2 at ¶ 8. Other treatments for dry eye, such as artificial tears, have been commercially available, but they only exhibit a palliative effect, and do not work to increase tear production or otherwise treat the disease. *See* Schiffman Declaration 2 at ¶ 4.

Third, the invention must in fact satisfy the long-felt need. MPEP 716.04. As shown by the FDA’s approval of RESTASIS® and the praise in the industry discussed by Dr. Schiffman at paragraph 8 of Schiffman Declaration 2, the claimed methods have satisfied the long felt need. As explained above, RESTASIS® has been met with great commercial success, which further shows the satisfaction of the long felt need.

Several other companies have tried to develop therapeutic drugs for FDA approval, but many have failed. *See* Schiffman Declaration 2 at ¶ 9 and Exhibit N. The Federal Circuit has implicitly accepted that failure to obtain FDA approval is relevant evidence of failure of others. *Knoll Pharm. Co. v Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.*, 367 F.3d 1381, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

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.