Page 1 1 2 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD 3 4 5 WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.,) 6 Petitioner,) IPR NO. 2017-01621 7) IPR NO. 2017-01622 vs. 8 UNITED THERAPEUTICS CORP.,) 9 Patent Owner.) 10 11 The videotaped deposition of DEFOREST 12 MCDUFF, Ph.D., called as a witness for 13 examination, taken pursuant to the Federal 14 Rules of Civil Procedure of the United States District Courts pertaining to the taking of 15 16 depositions, taken before ANDREA L. KIM, a 17 Certified Shorthand Reporter of said state, CSR No. 84-3722, at Suite 4800, 35 West Wacker 18 19 Drive, Chicago, Illinois, on the 6th day of 20 April, A.D. 2018, at 9:37 a.m. 21 22 23 24 25

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 1 of 297

Page 2 1 PRESENT: 2 Appeared on behalf of the Petitioner: 3 4 WINSTON & STRAWN, 5 35 West Wacker Drive, 6 Chicago, Illinois 60606 7 BY: KURT A. MATHAS, ESQ. 8 kmathas@winston.com 9 10 Appeared on behalf of Patent Owner: 11 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, 12 900 South Capital of Texas Highway, 13 Las Cimas IV, Fifth Floor, 14 Austin, Texas 78746-5546 BOBBY DELAFIELD, ESQ. 15 BY: 16 bdelafield@wsgr.com 17 -and-18 19 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP, 3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 600, 20 21 Washington, D.C. 20007 22 BY: STEPHEN B. MAEBIUS, ESQ. 23 smaebius@foley.com, 24 25 David Feldman Worldwide 800-642-1099 A Veritext Company www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 2 of 297

								Page	3
	ALSO	PRES	SENT:						
		MR.	SCOT	ZIARKO	, Vide	ogra	pher.		
	REPO	RTED	BY:	ANDREA	L. КІ	м,			
				Illinoi	s CSR	No.	84-37	22.	
800)-642-1099	6		David Feldm A Veritex	an Worldwi t Company	de		www.vei	ritext.coi
000		WATSC	ON LABO	ORATORIES	U		THERAP	EUTICS	S, EX. 2

ſ

	Page 4
	4
1	INDEX
2	
3	WITNESS: PAGE:
4	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
5	EXAM by MR. DELAFIELD
6	EXAM by MR. MATHAS 240
7	EXAM by MR. DELAFIELD 244
8	EXAM by MR. MATHAS 246
9	EXAM by MR. DELAFIELD 246
10	
11	
12	INDEX
13	EXHIBIT NUMBER MARKED
14	Exhibit No. 1 Article titled Thinking 190
15	Economically about Commercial Success
16	Exhibit No. 2 Copy of U.S. Patent 9,550.716231
17	Exhibit No. 3 Copy of U.S. Patent 8,410,121234
18	Exhibit No. 4 Declaration of DeForest 243
19	McDuff, Ph.D. Case IPR2017-01621
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
	25
25	
	David Feldman Worldwide 0-642-1099 A Veritext Company www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 4 of 297

	Page 5
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning.
3	We are on the record. This is the video
4	deposition of Dr. DeForest McDuff in the matter
5	of Watson Laboratories, Inc., versus United
6	Therapeutics Corporation. Today's date is
7	April 6, 2018. The time is now approximately
8	9:35 a.m.
9	My name is Scot Ziarko. I am with
10	David Feldman, and I am the videographer. The
11	court reporter is Andrea Kim.
12	Will counsel please identify
13	yourselves for the record, and will the court
14	reporter please swear in the witness.
15	MR. DELAFIELD: Bobby Delafield
16	with Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati for
17	patent owner and United Therapeutics.
18	MR. MAEBIUS: Stephen Maebius from
19	Foley & Lardner on behalf of patent owner
20	United Therapeutics.
21	MR. MATHAS: Good morning. Kurt
22	Mathas, Winston & Strawn on behalf of the
23	petitioner Watson Laboratories, Inc., and the
24	witness, Dr. DeForest McDuff.
25	

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 5 of 297

	Page 6
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	(WHEREUPON, the witness was duly
3	sworn.)
4	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: You may begin.
5	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.,
6	called as a witness herein, having been first
7	duly sworn, was examined and testified as
8	follows:
9	EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
11	Q. Good morning, Dr. McDuff.
12	A. Good morning.
13	Q. Could you please state your
14	full name for the record.
15	A. Robert DeForest McDuff.
16	Q. And I know you've been deposed
17	before, but I want to go over just a few ground
18	rules just as a reminder. The court reporter
19	has the task of taking down all of our words,
20	and so for every question I ask, if you could
21	give a verbal response and not a head nod or
22	uh-huh, and also because she has to take down
23	every word, please wait until I finish my
24	question, and I will wait until you finish your
25	answer to ask the next question.

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 6 of 297

Page 7 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Do you understand? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. Do you understand you are 5 obligated to tell the truth in response to my 6 questions? 7 Α. Yes. 8 Q. And do you understand that you 9 must answer all of my questions unless your 10 counsel instructs you not to? 11 Α. Yes, that's fine. 12 ο. If you need to take a break at 13 any point time today, as long as a question is 14 not pending, we can take a break. If for any 15 reason -- is there any reason that would 16 prevent you from giving your best answers in 17 response to my questions today? 18 Α. No. 19 Are you on any medication that Q. 20 would affect your testimony today? 21 Α. No. 22 Q. So approximately how many 23 times have you worked as an expert witness in 24 the past? 25 I've submitted more than 50 Α.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 7 of 297

Page 8 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 expert reports. I have been deposed around 40 3 times, and then there are additional cases 4 where I was retained but didn't submit an 5 expert report or never got deposed. 6 ο. Were all of those patent 7 cases? 8 Α. No. 9 About what percent were patent ο. 10 cases? 11 Α. It varies over time. It's 12 probably between 50 and 80 percent ballpark. 13 And of those cases, about what 0. 14 percent were pharmaceutical patent cases? 15 Ballpark around half, maybe Α. 16 more. 17 0. Have you ever been a fact 18 witness in a case? 19 Α. I have in one instance, yes. 20 And what was that? 0. 21 I provided testimony as a fact Α. 22 witness in a dispute related to student 23 cheating and my role at Academic Integrity 24 Seminar. 25 And what role did you play in 0.

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 8 of 297

Page 9 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 that case? 3 I was a tutor to a student Α. 4 that was identified as potentially plagiarizing 5 his answers, and so I provided factual 6 information about that incident. 7 So you weren't accused of 0. 8 cheating? 9 Α. Correct. 10 Q. Okay. Has your testimony ever 11 been excluded? 12 Α. It has in some instances, yes. Can you describe those 13 0. 14 instances? 15 There was one instance Α. 16 relating to a reasonable royalty in an 17 electronics case where my testimony was not 18 permitted, and then there have been four or 19 five instances where my testimony was 20 challenged on a variety of issues, and most or 21 at least the majority of my opinions were not 22 excluded, but there was some aspect of my 23 opinions that was not permitted. 24 0. So on the reasonable royalty 25 case you mentioned, do you recall why your

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 9 of 297

	Page 10
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	testimony was not permitted?
3	A. Yes, there were two main
4	issues there.
5	Q. What were those issues?
6	A. The first related to a
7	methodology for apportionment related to
8	vehicle tracker technology related to a type of
9	analysis called content analysis where one
10	quantifies apportionment based on how
11	frequently something occurs. The Court viewed
12	that methodology in the context of that case as
13	not appropriate.
14	The second issue was a
15	methodology in calibration related to
16	bargaining bargaining models and how parties
17	would negotiate in a hypothetical negotiation.
18	That was a methodology that was not permitted
19	by that Court. It was later challenged in
20	subsequent courts and permitted, and I've since
21	published peer-reviewed articles on both
22	topics. That's a summary of what that was
23	about.
24	Q. On the apportionment issue,
25	was that apportionment of the value of patents?

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 10 of 297

Page 11 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. It was apportionment related 3 to a reasonable royalty analysis. 4 Q. Was the reasonable royalty 5 analysis -- strike that. 6 Was it a patent case? 7 Α. It was, yes. 8 Q. So in that case did you 9 provide testimony as to different values for 10 different patents? 11 I don't recall specifically Α. 12 how many patents there were or what the 13 technology was not sitting here. 14 0. I am just trying to understand 15 what you meant by apportionment if you were 16 talking about your testimony giving value to 17 certain patents over others. 18 Is that what you did? 19 Α. Apportionment in a reasonable 20 royalty context is about determining the 21 contribution of a patent in a negotiation 22 relative to other factors and how one goes 23 about quantifying that. So it was a 24 quantification process for determining that 25 contribution.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 11 of 297

Page 12 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. So you determined the 3 contribution to a reasonable royalty rate of 4 certain patents, correct? 5 Α. Generally I agree with that, 6 yes. 7 And that testimony was Q. 8 excluded? 9 That portion was, yes. Α. 10 Q. Now you mentioned you have 11 provided a number of opinions on pharmaceutical 12 patent cases; is that correct? 13 Α. Yes. 14 0. How many of those did you find 15 that the pharmaceutical patent was not a 16 commercial success? 17 Α. I don't have a count for you 18 sitting here. 19 Do you know how many times you ο. 20 found that the pharmaceutical patent was a 21 commercial success? 22 Α. I don't have a count for you. 23 I'm sorry. 24 0. Have you ever found that a 25 pharmaceutical patent was a commercial success?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 12 of 297

	Page 13
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	A. I have, yes.
3	Q. Is it fair to say the majority
4	of the time you provide an opinion that the
5	patents you are asked to opine about you find
6	are not commercially successful?
7	A. I don't know. It's hard to
8	summarize in that way because it's not always
9	an opinion that a certain patent is or isn't
10	commercially successful. There's often a range
11	of issues that I am evaluating in a particular
12	case. I don't know that it's fair to describe
13	it that way for each patent at issue.
14	Q. Is it fair to say that you
15	have found patents to lack commercial success
16	more than you have found patents to have
17	achieved commercial success?
18	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
19	BY THE WITNESS:
20	A. I don't really think about it
21	as patents achieving commercial success or not.
22	That's not the way I would describe it.
23	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
24	Q. You have provided opinion in
25	this case about the commercial success of two

ſ

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 13 of 297

	Page 14
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	patents, correct?
3	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
4	BY THE WITNESS:
5	A. I would describe it as
6	commercial success as a secondary consideration
7	that relates to non-obviousness of two patents.
8	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
9	Q. So isn't that an opinion about
10	whether or not the patents in this case were
11	commercially successful?
12	A. I just wouldn't describe it
13	that way. I don't think of patents themselves
14	being commercially successful or not.
15	Commercial success of a product and a
16	technology is one factor that relates to
17	obviousness of certain patents.
18	Q. Let me put it a different way.
19	Would you agree with me that the majority of
20	the pharmaceutical patent cases that you have
21	been involved with you have found that the
22	secondary consideration of commercial success
23	favored that the patent was obvious?
24	A. I don't typically view my
25	opinion as weighing that a patent is obvious or

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 14 of 297

	Page 15
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	not. It's more about does the evidence
3	presented on commercial success as a secondary
4	consideration support obviousness.
5	Q. So is it fair to say that most
6	pharmaceutical patent cases that you have been
7	on you have found that the secondary
8	consideration secondary consideration of
9	commercial success favored obviousness?
10	A. I don't think of it that way.
11	It's not that the evidence favors obviousness.
12	It's whether I perform an evaluation of
13	whether the evidence should be used in favor of
14	non-obviousness.
15	Q. In this case would you say
16	that the commercial success of Tyvaso would be
17	in favor of obviousness?
18	A. I don't think of it that way.
19	I don't think of a lack of commercial success
20	as a secondary consideration favoring
21	obviousness. It is just that the secondary
22	consideration doesn't favor non-obviousness.
23	Q. Isn't that a double negative?
24	A. No, not as I think of it.
25	Q. So is it fair to say that in

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 15 of 297

	Page 16
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	the most most of the pharmaceutical patent
3	cases that you have been on, you have found
4	that the secondary consideration of commercial
5	success does not favor non-obviousness?
6	A. Would you mind reading the
7	question, please.
8	(WHEREUPON, the record was read
9	by the reporter.)
.0	BY THE WITNESS:
.1	A. What do you mean by most?
.2	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
.3	Q. More than 50 percent.
.4	A. Looking at all of the cases,
.5	that's probably true.
.6	Q. Would it be more than 75
.7	percent?
.8	A. I don't know.
.9	Q. So in all of the
20	pharmaceutical patent cases you have been on,
21	how often have you been retained by the brand
2	side, the patent owner?
23	A. I don't know. I don't have a
24	specific number for you.
25	Q. Can you name a couple?
	David Feldman Worldwide

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 16 of 297

Page 17 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. I mean, I can think of several 3 examples. 4 Could you provide a couple of Q. 5 examples? 6 So some cases that I have Α. 7 worked on would relate to being retained by the 8 patent owner for the drugs Herceptin, Noxafil, 9 Crestor. Those are some examples that come to 10 mind. 11 For those three, did you Q. 12 provide an opinion about the commercial success 13 of the patent? 14 Α. I think about it as commercial 15 success as a secondary consideration. In two 16 of the cases I was a consulting economist, and 17 one of the cases I was a testifying expert. 18 ο. Was your testimony related to 19 commercial success? 20 Α. It was. It was put forth in 21 support of a finding of commercial success as a 22 secondary consideration. 23 You have been retained by 0. 24 Watson before, correct? 25 Α. Yes.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 17 of 297

Page 18 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. How often have you been 3 retained by Watson? 4 Α. I don't have a specific count 5 for you, several times. 6 Ten to 15 times? Q. 7 Α. It's probably not that high, 8 no. 9 Did you meet with counsel in Q. 10 preparation for your deposition today? 11 Α. Yes. 12 0. Who did you meet with? 13 Α. I met with Mr. Mathas. 14 0. Did you meet with anyone else? 15 No. Α. 16 0. For how long did you meet to 17 prepare for your deposition? I met with Mr. Mathas for 18 Α. 19 about three to four hours. 20 0. Now, throughout this 21 deposition, you understand that you are here to 22 testify on behalf of two cases, correct? 23 Α. Yes. 24 And one is IPR 2017-01622, and 0. 25 the other is IPR 2017-01621, correct?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 18 of 297

Page 19 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Yes, that's right. 3 0. So throughout the deposition 4 unless I specify a specific case or a specific 5 patent, you understand my question to pertain 6 to both. 7 Is that fair? 8 Α. I can do that, yes. 9 And if your answer differs ο. 10 based on one patent or the other in the two 11 cases, will you provide different answers? 12 Α. I will do my best to do so. 13 And if you don't provide a 0. 14 different answer, your answer will be for both 15 cases. 16 Is that fair? 17 I don't know how it works Α. procedurally, but I'll do my best to answer as 18 19 applicable to both cases. 20 0. Okay. When were you first retained for these two cases? 21 22 Α. I believe it was in early 23 2017. I don't have an exact date. 24 Approximately how many hours Q. 25 have you spent on these two cases so far?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 19 of 297

Page 20 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. I don't have an exact estimate 3 for you. It's probably greater than 20 hours, less than 80. Somewhere in that range. 4 5 ο. So between 20 and 80 hours 6 total? 7 It's very ballpark. Α. I don't 8 have specific recollection, but that seems like 9 a likely range to me. 10 0. Other than counsel, have you 11 spoken to anyone else about this deposition or 12 either of these cases since the time you were 13 retained? 14 Α. Yes, I spoke with a member of 15 my staff working at my direction. His name is 16 Mr. Noah Brennan. 17 ο. And what did you talk about 18 with him? 19 Mr. Brennan and I discussed Α. 20 the upcoming deposition, and he also assisted 21 with the preparation of my declarations as part 22 of our work on the case. 23 Did he write part of your 0. 24 declarations? 25 He may have drafted certain Α. David Feldman Worldwide

800-642-1099

A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 20 of 297

Page 21 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 portions. Typically -- I don't remember 3 exactly what parts he may or may not have drafted in these cases, but a typical work 4 5 process would be that someone working at my 6 direction may draft parts of the declaration 7 that I later review and edit. He may have done 8 so here. I simply don't recall. 9 Did he do any of the ο. 10 calculations that are presented in your 11 declarations? 12 Α. He did assist with those, yes. 13 0. Do you know approximately what 14 percent of the calculations he performed? 15 Mr. Brennan performed the Α. 16 majority of the calculations at my direction. 17 I don't have a percentage for you, but most of 18 the calculations he directly performed working 19 with me. What is Mr. Brennan's 20 0. 21 educational background? 22 Α. He has a Bachelor's Degree and 23 a Master's Degree in development economics. 24 And how long has he worked 0. 25 with you?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 21 of 297

	Page 22
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	MR. MATHAS: I am going to object
3	to the form and this whole line of questioning
4	but go ahead.
5	BY THE WITNESS:
6	A. He has worked with me at
7	Insight Economics for about a year. He and I
8	have also worked together at a previous
9	employer for something like three or four years
10	in addition to the one year at Insight.
11	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
12	Q. Did you start work on this
13	case at your previous employer?
14	A. No, I don't believe so.
15	Q. Did you talk to any other
16	expert in this case about strike that.
17	Did you talk to any other
18	expert retained by Watson about this case?
19	A. No. Yet, as indicated in my
20	declaration, I did review the declaration of
21	Dr. Donovan.
22	Q. But you didn't have any
23	discussions with her?
24	A. No.
25	Q. Did you exchange any emails or
800	David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 22 of 297

Page 23 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 any kind of correspondence with Dr. Donovan? 3 Α. No. 4 (WHEREUPON, the document was 5 tendered to the witness.) 6 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 7 You have been handed what's 0. 8 been premarked as Exhibit 1055 for IPR 9 2017-01622. 10 (WHEREUPON, the document was 11 tendered to the witness.) 12 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 13 And you have also been handed 0. 14 what's been marked as Exhibit 1055 for IPR 2017-01621. 15 16 Turning first to the 01622 or 17 for the '507 patent, if you understand that, do you recognize this document? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 0. Is this a copy of your declaration? 21 22 Α. It appears to be, yes. 23 Is this a complete and 0. 24 accurate copy of your declaration? 25 Sitting here skimming through Α.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 23 of 297

Page 24 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 it, it appears to be, yes. 3 0. If you could turn to page 25, 4 is that your signature on the declaration? 5 Α. It is, yes. 6 0. And you signed it June 21, 7 2017? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Now, you mentioned your ο. 10 assistant helped you write your declaration; is 11 that correct? 12 Α. I don't believe that was my 13 testimony, no. 14 0. No one helped you write this 15 declaration? Well, as I've described, I 16 Α. 17 don't have specific recollection of whether 18 Mr. Brennan assisted with the drafting of the 19 declaration. Often he does when I do work with 20 him, but I just don't remember whether he did 21 for this declaration specifically. 22 Q. Did anyone else help you draft 23 your declaration? 24 Α. I don't believe so, no. 25 Counsel didn't help you draft 0.

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 24 of 297

Page 25 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 the declaration? 3 Α. No. 4 0. You cite several articles in 5 your declaration, correct? 6 Α. I do, yes. 7 Who found those articles? 0. 8 Α. I did along with research 9 support from Mr. Brennan. 10 Q. Now, if you turn to page 26 of 11 your declaration, this is the first page of 12 your CV; is that correct? 13 Α. Yes. 14 0. And is this a true and 15 accurate copy of your CV? 16 It is as of June 2017. Α. 17 0. Could you briefly go through 18 your educational background. 19 Α. Yes, I have a Bachelor's 20 Degree -- I have two Bachelor's Degrees form 21 the University of Maryland at College Park, one 22 in economics, and one in mathematics. I would 23 note that there's a typo here in the CV. It 24 says a Bachelor's of Arts in Economics and a 25 Bachelor of Science in Economics. That's since

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 25 of 297

Page 26 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 been corrected. It's a Bachelor of Science in 3 Mathematics from the University of Maryland. 4 I also have a Master's in 5 Economics from Princeton University and a Ph.D. 6 in Economics from Princeton University. 7 And what year did you obtain 0. 8 your Ph.D.? 9 In 2009. Α. 10 Q. I noticed in your declaration 11 and your CV you did not put the year you 12 graduated. 13 Is there any reason you didn't 14 put the year? 15 Α. No. 16 So as of 2009, did you 0. 17 consider yourself to be an expert in economics? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Did you consider yourself to Ο. 20 be an expert in economics with respect to 21 pharmaceutical patents? 22 Α. It would depend on what aspect 23 of economic analysis I was evaluating. Some 24 aspects definitely, yes. Others I would say I 25 accumulated experience in the pharmaceutical

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 26 of 297

Page 27 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 industry over time in my professional 3 experience as a consultant. I don't know at 4 what point I would consider myself an expert, 5 but certainly for any case where I put myself 6 forth as an expert and submitted an expert 7 report and I felt qualified at that time. 8 Q. Do you recall how long after 9 receiving your Ph.D. that you provided expert 10 testimony in a pharmaceutical patent case? 11 Looking at page 34 of Exhibit Α. 12 1055 which is the last page of my CV, I do 13 remember my first case which didn't relate to 14 pharmaceuticals, but I testified as an expert 15 with respect to patents. That was in 2009. So 16 that was immediately following my graduation 17 and earning my Ph.D., and then specifically as to pharmaceutical cases, the first one that 18 19 comes to mind is number 34 which is listed on 20 the previous page on page 32, UCB versus Teva. 21 That would have been in the 2013 to 2014 range. 22 I, of course, worked on a number of 23 pharmaceutical cases as a consultant prior to 24 that time. 25 So the first pharmaceutical 0.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 27 of 297

Page 28 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 patent case in which you provided expert 3 opinions was in the 2013 to 2014 range? 4 Α. As a testifying expert, that's 5 right. Prior to that, of course, I provided 6 consulting expertise. 7 So you mentioned that you 0. 8 considered yourself an expert with respect to 9 economics at the time you obtained your Ph.D.; 10 is that correct? 11 Α. Yes. 12 0. So would anyone with a Ph.D. 13 in economics at the time of their graduation be 14 an expert? I don't know. 15 It depends on Α. 16 the context probably. It certainly is an 17 advanced degree that has recognition of 18 expertise? 19 What was the subject of your Ο. 20 Ph.D. dissertation? 21 The field was in applied Α. 22 micro-economics and financial economics, and 23 the subject of my Ph.D. research related to 24 financial markets in housing and real estate 25 and decisions of -- labor market decisions of

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 28 of 297

Page 29 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 students to attend colleges and universities. 3 0. So it was not related to 4 patents? 5 Α. The scope was not specific to 6 patents. Yet certainly the expertise I 7 developed does go into my education and 8 experience as an expert that allows me to opine 9 in patent cases. 10 0. But your Ph.D. dissertation 11 was not related to patents, correct? 12 Α. It strikes me as the same 13 question. I will provide the same answer. 14 Well, it is just yes or no. 0. 15 Did your Ph.D. dissertation 16 discuss patents? 17 Α. It did not specifically 18 discuss patents. 19 And your Ph.D. dissertation Ο. 20 did not discuss pharmaceuticals, correct? 21 Not specifically, I don't Α. 22 believe so. 23 During your education, did you ο. 24 take any courses on pharmaceutical patents --25 related to pharmaceutical patents?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 29 of 297

Page 30 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Certainly my course work as a 3 Ph.D. student does contribute to my expertise 4 as an economist that I then apply to patent 5 cases, but specifically with respect to 6 pharmaceutical patents, the only class that 7 comes to mind is a second year graduate course 8 in health economics where we discussed, you 9 know, pharmaceutical development and research, 10 and I believe patents came up in that context. 11 Do you recall if whether a 0. 12 patent is valid or not came up in that context? 13 I don't remember. Α. 14 0. Do you recall whether 15 analyzing commercial success of patents came up 16 in that course? 17 I don't believe it did. Α. Ι 18 don't recall. 19 You have never worked for a Ο. 20 pharmaceutical company as a full-time job, 21 correct? 22 Α. Not as an employee. I have as 23 a consultant. 24 0. And you are not an expert in 25 drug formulation, correct?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 30 of 297

Page 31 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. No, not as I think of it. 3 0. And you are not an expert in 4 inhalable drug delivery, correct? 5 Α. Not from a clinical 6 perspective. I have analyzed aspects of that 7 from an economic perspective here in this case. 8 Q. But the technology involved 9 with inhalable drug delivery, you are not an 10 expert in the technology, correct? 11 Not as a technical expert. Α. Ι 12 perform my work from the perspective of an 13 economist. 14 ο. And you are not an expert in 15 FDA regulations, correct? 16 Α. Not in terms of specific 17 expertise. It is something that frequently 18 comes up in my work, and I evaluate from an 19 economic perspective but not an area that I 20 would claim independent expertise. 21 And you are not an expert in ο. 22 the treatment of pulmonary hypertension? 23 Not from a clinical Α. 24 perspective, no. I am an economist. 25 0. You are not an expert in

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 31 of 297

	Page 32
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	patent law, correct?
3	A. I'm not an attorney. I
4	frequently consider issues of patent law from
5	an economic perspective but not from a legal
6	perspective.
7	Q. Have you ever consulted with a
8	pharmaceutical company in connection with a
9	decision of whether or not to launch a
LO	particular drug?
11	A. I have, yes.
12	Q. Do you recall an example of
13	that?
L 4	A. I have performed that kind of
15	consultation on a number of occasions, maybe a
16	half dozen times. Two types of examples would
17	be a generic supplier considering to launch a
18	generic product and how the market would evolve
19	as a result of that launch. The second type of
20	example is a company evaluating the launch of a
21	branded product and how the result of that
22	launch would be from an economic and market
23	perspective.
24	Q. Have you ever consulted a
25	pharmaceutical company with respect to pricing
800-	David Feldman Worldwide 642-1099 A Veritext Company www.veritext

Γ

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 32 of 297

Page 33 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 of a pharmaceutical product? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. Would you agree that pricing is a relevant factor to commercial success? 5 It can be. It depends on the 6 Α. 7 context. 8 Q. Have you yourself used pricing 9 in your analysis of commercial success in any 10 case? 11 Α. I have evaluated pricing in 12 other cases. 13 What is the relevant time 0. 14 period to examine whether a pharmaceutical 15 product has achieved commercial success? 16 Α. It depends what you mean by 17 relevant time period. Would you mind trying to 18 clarify? 19 Well, that's what I am asking Q. 20 you. 21 What is your understanding of 22 the time period needed to be analyzed for 23 commercial success? 24 Well, I can describe how I Α. 25 think about it. We are sitting here today in

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 33 of 297

	Page 34
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	2018. So this is a relevant time period in the
3	sense that this is when we are doing the
4	analysis or 2017 is when I performed the
5	analysis, and the analysis is applicable to a
6	determination of obviousness back around the
7	time of the invention. So it would be back
8	around the priority dates of the
9	patents-at-issue, and just to follow up, of
10	course, examining the sales that occurred over
11	time, that would be relevant time period as I
12	think about it.
13	Q. When you say sales over time,
14	would you agree that the average sales over
15	time is a relevant factor to consider for
16	commercial success?
17	A. It depends what you mean by
18	that. I might be open to considering it.
19	Q. Let's say average sales per
20	year.
21	A. I would be open to considering
22	it. It's not something that is typically
23	calculated. More often myself or other experts
24	working in this area would simply plot the
25	sales over time by year and show the sales over

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 34 of 297

	Page 35
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	time, but average sales could be something one
3	could look at.
4	Q. And total sales is an
5	important factor to consider for commercial
6	success as well, correct?
7	A. It depends on it depends on
8	how one is using it. I would be open to
9	considering it.
10	Q. When would total sales not be
11	relevant to commercial success?
12	A. It just depends how one is
13	using it and interpreting it. I typically try
14	to find a summary metric like the ones I have
15	provided in my report or my declarations in
16	this case. For example, peak sales in a given
17	year that's a good way to provide an
18	apples-to-apples comparison between products.
19	I don't recall providing total
20	sales over time in this declaration because
21	it's often hard to find an apples-to-apples
22	comparison without a determinant. So, again, I
23	am open to considering total sales, but it's
24	not something I believe I calculated or
25	compared here.

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099 UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 35 of 297

Page 36 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. If you turn to page 38 of 3 Exhibit 1055 of the '507 patent which is 4 Attachment B-4. 5 Do you see that? 6 Α. I do, yes. 7 And it lists PAH Drug Revenues 0. by Year. 8 9 Do you see that? 10 Α. I do. 11 And that's referring to ο. 12 pulmonary arterial hypertension? 13 It is, yes. Α. 14 0. And you list Tyvaso as the 15 second entry, correct? 16 Α. Correct. 17 Q. And that's the drug in which 18 the '507 patent and the '240 patent are listed 19 in the Orange Book for, correct? 20 Α. Correct. 21 That's the drug you analyzed Q. 22 in both of your declarations, correct? 23 A. Yes, among other drugs. 24 And then to the far right, you Q. 25 have a total of \$2.515 billion; is that

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 36 of 297

Page 37 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 correct? 3 Correct, for Tyvaso. Α. 4 Q. So you did calculate total 5 revenue over -- since launch, correct? 6 I did. I had forgotten about Α. 7 this attachment in my previous response. Ι don't believe it's referenced in the 8 9 declaration text which is what I was thinking 10 about. 11 Q. Before I forget, if you could 12 turn to Exhibit 1055 for IPR 2017-10621 for the 13 '240 patent. 14 Do you recognize this 15 document? 16 I do. Α. 17 Q. And is this a true and 18 accurate copy of your declaration for the '240 19 patent? 20 Α. I understand that this may 21 have been a version that was submitted, but 22 this version does not include my attachment 23 calculations which can be seen on Exhibit 1055 24 in the 1622 declaration. 25 So the 1621 declaration here

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 37 of 297

	Page 38
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	in front of me does not provide those
3	attachment calculations. I understand that
4	there was a version provided to patent holder
5	at some point with those attachments.
6	MR. MATHAS: And for the record,
7	Bobby, I have copies here. You are welcome to
8	use them if you would like.
9	MR. DELAFIELD: For the record, we
10	object to the use of those declarations. You
11	submitted this declaration almost a year ago,
12	and we did not receive those until last night
13	so.
14	MR. MATHAS: Do you allege any
15	that you suffered any prejudice from this
16	considering you had the information in the
17	other declaration?
18	MR. DELAFIELD: Well, it's not
19	clear we had the information in the other
20	declaration. We just got it last night. So we
21	are still evaluating it.
22	MR. MATHAS: Well, you are welcome
23	to ask Mr. McDuff that or Dr. McDuff that.
24	I am sure he can testify about it at some point
25	today.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 38 of 297

Page 39 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 3 So Exhibit 1055 that shows 0. 4 page 1 through 25 for IPR 2017-01621, this was 5 the copy submitted to the patent office in June 6 of 2017, correct? 7 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 8 BY THE WITNESS: 9 I would defer to counsel on Α. 10 that in terms of what was submitted. My 11 declaration I think of it as including the 12 declaration as well as attachments. They are 13 the same as what was provided in my declaration 14 for 1622. 15 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 16 Well, if you turn to page 25 0. 17 of the '240 declaration, is that your 18 signature? 19 It is, yes. Α. 20 Q. And you signed it June 21, 21 2017? 22 Α. Yes. 23 And this version doesn't have 0. 24 any attachments, correct? 25 This one in front of me, no. Α.

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 39 of 297

	Page 40
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Q. And, similarly, if you look at
3	paragraph 15, there appears to be a missing
4	chart; is that correct?
5	A. Yes. My understanding is that
6	this is some sort of printing issue. You can
7	see the corresponding chart that should be
8	there on in paragraph 15 of the 1622
9	declaration, and my understanding is that this
10	chart was included in an updated version of my
11	declaration that was provided to the patent
12	holder at some point. It can also be seen in
13	the underlying documents that are cited here in
14	footnote 6.
15	Q. At what point did you realize
16	that the declaration for the '240 patent did
17	not contain the attachments?
18	A. That was yesterday when I was
19	flying from Boston to Chicago in preparation
20	for this deposition.
21	Q. So since June of 2017, you
22	hadn't noticed that there were no attachments
23	to this declaration?
24	A. I was not aware that they were
25	omitted until yesterday morning.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 40 of 297

Page 41 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. Now, other than the absence of attachments and the figure in paragraph 15 in 3 4 the '240 declaration as well as cites to the 5 different prosecution histories for the '507 patent versus the '240 patent and the different 6 7 declarations from Dr. Donovan, are you aware of 8 any other differences between these two 9 declarations? 10 Α. This may be a minor point, but 11 the two declarations do reference their 12 respective patents in paragraphs 8 and 9 where 13 describing the patents-at-issue and then other 14 places where they reference the patent. That's 15 the only other difference that comes to mind. 16 So your opinions with respect 0. 17 to Tyvaso are the same in both declarations. 18 Is that fair to say? 19 Α. As a summary opinion, I would 20 agree with that. I draw the same conclusions 21 in both declarations. 22 (WHEREUPON, the document was 23 tendered to the witness.) 24 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 25 You have been handed what's 0.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 41 of 297

Page 42 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 been marked as Exhibit 1001 for IPR 2017-01622. 3 Do you recognize this 4 document? 5 Α. I do. 6 This is U.S. Patent 9,339,507, Q. 7 correct? 8 Α. It appears to be, yes. 9 Have you reviewed this 0. 10 document? 11 Α. Yes. 12 0. Is it important to understand 13 the claimed subject matter of the patents to 14 perform your analysis? 15 As a general matter from the Α. 16 perspective of an economist, it's one of the 17 things that I do. I would say it's important 18 to understand from an economic perspective. 19 Did anyone assist you with Q. 20 understanding the technical aspects of this 21 patent? 22 Α. Yes, I read the patent myself. 23 I discussed the patent and the claimed 24 inventions with counsel. I also reviewed the 25 declaration of Dr. Donovan.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 42 of 297

	Page 43
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Q. Did you do anything to
3	understand the patent?
4	A. Yes, I also reviewed the
5	patent prosecution and the documents that I
6	cite in my declaration with respect to the
7	claimed invention and associated benefits.
8	Q. If you turn to the back page
9	24, you see a list of claims under column 18.
10	Do you see that?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Which claims did you analyze
13	for your analysis?
14	A. My analysis addresses the
15	claims collectively. I don't recall providing
16	a breakdown or differentiation of one claim
17	versus another.
18	Q. Do you understand that each
19	claim of a patent is its own invention?
20	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
21	BY THE WITNESS:
22	A. I wouldn't purport to provide
23	a legal conclusion or perspective on that. I
24	am familiar with that notion.
25	

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 43 of 297

Page 44 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 3 Do you know which claims of 0. 4 the '507 patent are at issue in this case? 5 Α. Sitting here, I don't recall. You don't specify any claims 6 0. 7 in your declaration for the '507 patent, 8 correct? 9 I don't believe so. As Α. indicated, I have addressed the claims 10 11 collectively rather than individually. 12 0. But you agree there are 13 differences within the claims, right? 14 Α. I believe so, yes. 15 But you didn't provide any Q. 16 separate analysis for any specific claim, 17 correct? 18 Α. As I described, I addressed 19 the claims collectively. I did not provide a 20 breakdown or direct analysis of individual 21 claims compared to other claims. And to clarify, you don't know 22 Q. 23 which claims are at issue in this case? 24 Sitting here, I don't recall. Α. 25

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 44 of 297

Page 45 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 (WHEREUPON, the document was 3 tendered to the witness.) 4 BY MR. DELAFIELD: You have been handed what's 5 0. 6 been marked as Exhibit 1001 for IPR 2017-01621 7 which is U.S. Patent 9,358,240. 8 Do you recognize this 9 document? 10 Α. I do, yes. 11 Have you reviewed this ο. 12 document? Α. 13 Yes. 14 0. Now, the same questions I 15 asked for the '507 patent. If you could turn 16 to page 24. Did you provide an analysis for 17 each -- strike that. 18 Do you know which claims are 19 at issue in this case for the '240 patent? 20 Α. Sitting here, I don't recall. 21 And like the '540 -- strike Q. 22 that. 23 Like the '507 patent, you only 24 provided an analysis of the claims as a whole 25 and not individually, correct?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099 UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 45 of 297

	Page 46
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
3	BY THE WITNESS:
4	A. I wouldn't describe it that
5	way. I do agree that I evaluated the claims
6	collectively rather than providing distinctions
7	of one claim versus another, but as I think of
8	it, my analysis applies to all of the claims as
9	well as the individual claims.
10	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
11	Q. So for both patents, you agree
12	that your opinion applies to all of the claims
13	for both patents; is that correct?
14	A. I agree with that, yes.
15	Q. And so by that rationale, all
16	of the claims embody Tyvaso, correct or
17	strike that or Tyvaso would embody all of
18	the claims of both patents, correct?
19	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
20	BY THE WITNESS:
21	A. I haven't provided an opinion
22	on that.
23	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
24	Q. Well, your opinion is about
25	Tyvaso primarily, correct?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 46 of 297

Page 47 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 3 BY THE WITNESS: It's about commercial success 4 Α. 5 aspects of Tyvaso, yes. 6 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 7 And so if one claim was not 0. 8 covered by Tyvaso, that would change your 9 analysis, right? 10 Α. Sitting here, I don't see how 11 my opinions would be any different if that were 12 true. 13 What is the difference between 0. 14 these two patents? 15 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 16 BY THE WITNESS: 17 I would defer to technical Α. 18 experts to provide technical opinions on the 19 differences. My understanding at a very high 20 level from an economic perspective is that the 21 '507 patent has claims that relate to kits, and 22 the '240 patent has claims that relate to 23 methods, and largely they are similar in 24 aspects as well. 25

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 47 of 297

	Page 48
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
3	Q. But for your opinion, you did
4	not provide different analyses for the two
5	patents, correct?
6	A. I submitted separate
7	declarations one for each patent. Yet as an
8	economist, my opinions are the same with
9	respect to the '240 patent and the '507 patent.
10	I viewed the analysis as appropriately similar
11	across the two patents.
12	Q. So you would agree that the
13	equipment and methods described in the claims
14	of the '240 patent and the '507 patent are
15	required to use Tyvaso, correct?
16	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
17	BY THE WITNESS:
18	A. I don't recall providing an
19	opinion on that one way or the other.
20	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
21	Q. Well, that is why you provide
22	opinions about Tyvaso because these two patents
23	are listed in the Orange Book as being covered
24	by Tyvaso, correct?
25	A. That's my understanding.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 48 of 297

	Page 49
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Q. So you would agree that the
3	claims of the '240 patent and the '507 patent
4	are required to use Tyvaso?
5	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
6	BY THE WITNESS:
7	A. I don't know if I would go so
8	far as to say required. I don't believe I have
9	provided that opinion. I do understand these
10	patents to be listed in the FDA Orange Book.
11	So from an economic perspective, I understand
12	they are alleged to cover Tyvaso.
13	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
14	Q. Are you aware of any evidence
15	that a patient can use Tyvaso without the
16	claimed kit and methods described in the '240
17	patent or the '507 patent?
18	A. I would have to think more
19	about that to provide a conclusion on that from
20	a global perspective, but I do understand that
21	there are certain limitations here in claims 1
22	of each patent, and that there are other ways
23	to deliver treprostinil in inhaled form that
24	would not fall under the scope of these
25	patents.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 49 of 297

	Page 50
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	For example, what's listed
3	here in claim 1 about being delivered via a
4	nebulizer or having certain opto-acoustical
5	triggers, for example.
6	Q. So you are saying you are
7	aware that treprostinil can be delivered in
8	inhaled form not using the technology described
9	in the '240 patent or the '507 patent?
10	A. That's my understanding. I
11	would defer to a clinician or a technical
12	expert to provide a conclusion or an opinion on
13	that point.
14	Q. You don't provide any evidence
15	that treprostinil can be used in an inhaled
16	form other than used through the equipment and
17	methods described in the '507 patent and the
18	'240 patent, correct?
19	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
20	BY THE WITNESS:
21	A. Would you mind reading the
22	question, please.
23	(WHEREUPON, the record was read
24	by the reporter.)
25	

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 50 of 297

	Page 51
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	BY THE WITNESS:
3	A. For my purposes, that's not
4	something I specifically set out to do, nor
5	have done, but I think looking at the patents,
6	it's to some degree common sense that the
7	patents describe delivering treprostinil
8	through inhaled form. They describe a metered
9	dose inhaler, but I understand that that is
10	different than the claims.
11	There are certain limitations
12	here in claim 1 such as the opto-acoustical
13	trigger. So, for example, if one wanted to
14	provide with a different kind of trigger, just
15	an acoustical trigger, I think it is sensible
16	that it could be delivered that way, but it's
17	not something that I am providing a clinical
18	opinion on. That's just my understanding as an
19	economist.
20	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
21	Q. But you don't have any
22	evidence that treprostinil could be used in an
23	inhaled form other than how it's described in
24	the '240 patent and the '507 patent, correct?
25	MR. MATHAS: Same objection.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 51 of 297

	Page 52
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	BY THE WITNESS:
3	A. As I have described in my
4	previous response, that's not a question that I
5	set out to answer or provide an independent
6	opinion or conclusion on. Yet I think reading
7	the patents, that's to some degree clear, and
8	that's my understanding, but it's not something
9	I specifically set out to provide evidence or
10	draw an opinion on.
11	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
12	Q. So it is just speculation?
13	A. I wouldn't describe it that
14	way.
15	Q. Well, how do you know that
16	treprostinil could be used in inhaled form in
17	any other way but those described in these two
18	patents?
19	A. That's my understanding as an
20	economist of what is claimed by the patents and
21	what is described in the patents in the
22	background in the summary.
23	Q. Are you aware of anyone ever
24	inhaling treprostinil other than through use of
25	the kit and methods described in the '507

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 52 of 297

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

Page 53 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 patent and the '240 patent? 3 I don't know. That's not Α. 4 something I set out to evaluate. 5 So you said you didn't set out Ο. 6 to evaluate. 7 If there was another nebulizer 8 or process to inhale treprostinil that was 9 available on the market, wouldn't that be 10 relevant as competition for commercial success? 11 Α. It could be. 12 0. But you didn't investigate 13 that? 14 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. BY THE WITNESS: 15 16 I did evaluate competition for Α. 17 Tyvaso. I evaluated a number of PAH drugs. I 18 don't recall there being a competing product 19 that delivers treprostinil in an inhaled form. 20 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 21 So sitting here today, you are 0. 22 not aware of any other -- strike that. 23 So sitting here today, you are 24 not aware of any other way to administer 25 treprostinil in an inhaled form except for

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 53 of 297

Page 54 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 what's described by the '240 and '507 patents? 3 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 4 BY THE WITNESS: 5 Α. I don't believe that was my 6 testimony, no. 7 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 8 Q. You are not aware of a 9 competing product that delivered treprostinil 10 in an inhaled form, correct? 11 Α. Outside of Tyvaso, that's 12 correct. 13 And so the kit and methods 0. 14 described in the claims of the '240 patent and 15 the '507 patent are necessary to use Tyvaso, 16 correct? 17 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 18 BY THE WITNESS: 19 Α. I don't believe I have 20 provided an opinion on that one way or the 21 other. 22 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 23 You have reviewed the label ο. 24 for Tyvaso, correct? 25 Α. I believe so, yes.

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 54 of 297

	Page 55
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Q. Do you recall that it
3	describes the kit and process used to inhale
4	treprostinil?
5	A. I don't recall specifically
6	what it says with respect to the kit and the
7	method claimed here in these patents.
8	Q. But is it your understanding
9	that the kit and methods used to administer
10	Tyvaso use the technology claimed in the '240
11	and '507 patents?
12	A. I mean, I do understand that
13	they are listed in the FDA Orange Book to cover
14	Tyvaso. So I have that understanding that they
15	are alleged to cover Tyvaso. Whether all
16	administration of Tyvaso falls within the scope
17	of these claims, I am not sure. I didn't set
18	out to evaluate that.
19	Q. If they don't fall within the
20	scope of these claims, wouldn't that affect
21	your opinion on commercial success strike
22	that.
23	So let's say, for example, you
24	could nebulize and administer treprostinil
25	through an inhaled form using a different type
	D (101) W 11 (1

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 55 of 297

	Page 56
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	of inhalation process. That would be known as
3	a design around.
4	Are you familiar with that
5	term?
6	A. I am familiar with that term.
7	Q. And so if a design around was
8	available, wouldn't that be relevant to
9	commercial success in terms of what else was
10	available to administer treprostinil?
11	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
12	BY THE WITNESS:
13	A. It could be relevant, and as
14	discussed in my declaration, I haven't seen any
15	evidence from patent owner that these specific
16	limitations provide benefits relative to an
17	alternative form of delivery that did not have
18	these limitations. That's one of the opinions
19	I provide.
20	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
21	Q. You said you reviewed the
22	prosecution history, correct?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And do you recall the
25	declarations of Dr. Zamanian?

ſ

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 56 of 297

Page 57 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. I do. 3 And in those declarations he 0. 4 provided clinical benefits of Tyvaso over other 5 inhaled pulmonary hypertension treatments, 6 right? 7 Relative to Venativs, as I Α. 8 recall. 9 Yes. So you have seen ο. 10 evidence from patent owner that those specific 11 declarations provide benefits to an alternative 12 form of delivery, right? 13 I don't agree with that. Α. I 14 discuss that in my declaration that differences 15 between Tyvaso and Venativs are largely 16 attributable to the treprostinil compound 17 itself. That's based on review of Dr. Donovan's declaration. 18 19 And you don't have any Q. 20 independent opinion on that point other than 21 your reference to Dr. Donovan's declaration; is 22 that correct? 23 Well, I provide an evaluation Α. 24 of the economic aspect of that. So if 25 Dr. Donovan provides the clinical aspect with

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 57 of 297

Page 58 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 respect to the difference between the two 3 products being the chemical compound, I then 4 provide an economic opinion based on that which 5 is, thus, there's no connection based on that 6 comparison between the patents and the 7 commercial performance of Tyvaso. 8 Q. Assuming that the kit and 9 methods described in the '240 and '507 patents 10 are required to use Tyvaso, then whatever 11 commercial success Tyvaso obtained, part of 12 that success would be attributable to the '240 13 patent and the '507 patent if those are 14 required, correct? 15 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 16 BY THE WITNESS: 17 Α. Could you read the question, 18 please. 19 (WHEREUPON, the record was read 20 by the reporter.) 21 BY THE WITNESS: 22 Α. No, I wouldn't agree with 23 that, not as a global conclusion. 24 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 25 Why not? 0.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 58 of 297

Page 59 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Well, one example that comes 3 to mind is if they were required from some FDA 4 regulation perspective that this was one thing 5 that was required by the FDA yet there was 6 another method or another design that would 7 have worked just as easily well, I wouldn't 8 necessarily conclude a nexus between the 9 commercial performance and the patents-at-issue 10 just because it was required from an FDA 11 perspective. 12 0. Are you aware of the FDA 13 requiring the specific type of equipment and 14 method used in the '240 and '507 patents in 15 this case? 16 I don't recall sitting here. Α. 17 That's not something I specifically set out to 18 evaluate. 19 So in general if you are Ο. 20 evaluating a product covered by multiple 21 patents and part of that product is covered --22 strike that. 23 For example, if you are 24 considering the commercial success of a car, 25 which is probably covered by thousands of

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 59 of 297

	Page 60
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	patents, you would agree that a patent on the
3	wheels would be a required component of that
4	car, correct?
5	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
6	BY THE WITNESS:
7	A. Well, in that example a
8	specific kind of wheel might be required for a
9	specific kind of car based on some external
10	regulation like a highway regulation or a
11	transportation regulation for the specifics of
12	that car, but you wouldn't necessarily conclude
13	a nexus or a connection to those patents
14	because it's possible that that car could have
15	a different kind of tire and still be a
16	commercially viable car with no difference to
17	demand for the car.
18	So just because it's required
19	from some sort of regulatory perspective
20	doesn't necessarily mean that there's a nexus
21	or connection to the patent at issue.
22	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
23	Q. So in this example are you
24	saying there would still be a demand for a car
25	without wheels?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 60 of 297

	Page 61
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
3	BY THE WITNESS:
4	A. No, that's not what I am
5	saying.
6	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
7	Q. Well, going back to Tyvaso,
8	you are not aware of any method of delivering
9	treprostinil through inhalation methods
10	commercially available other than Tyvaso,
11	correct?
12	A. I'm sorry. Could you read the
13	question again.
14	(WHEREUPON, the record was read
15	by the reporter.)
16	BY THE WITNESS:
17	A. In terms of a competing
18	product, I am not aware of products that
19	compete with Tyvaso that provide inhaled
20	treprostinil. Whether Tyvaso could be
21	administered outside the claims of the
22	patents-at-issue that may be true.
23	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
24	Q. But are not aware of any
25	evidence that that is true, correct?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 61 of 297

Page 62 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 3 BY THE WITNESS: I don't believe that's 4 Α. 5 something I specifically sought out to confirm 6 one way or the other. 7 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 8 Q. So you are not aware of any 9 evidence that that is true, right? 10 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 11 BY THE WITNESS: 12 Α. Not sitting here as it's not 13 something that I set out to evaluate. It seems 14 sensible to me that it could be true given my 15 understanding of the claims of the patents 16 here. 17 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 18 Q. But, again, you are not aware 19 of anyone ever administering treprostinil via 20 inhalation other than through use of the 21 equipment provided with Tyvaso, correct? 22 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 23 BY THE WITNESS: 24 Α. If I understand your question, 25 it's just not something that I have sought to

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 62 of 297

	Page 63
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	evaluate or provide a conclusion on one way or
3	the other.
4	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
5	Q. Since you didn't seek to
6	evaluate it, you are not aware of any evidence
7	that would show that a person could take
8	treprostinil in an inhaled form except through
9	using the Tyvaso system, correct?
10	A. Well, based on my
11	understanding of the claims and the reading of
12	the patents, it seems sensible to me that one
13	could do that, but I have not sought to provide
14	that opinion or evaluate evidence to support
15	that claim.
16	Q. But are not a technical
17	expert, right?
18	A. No.
19	Q. So you don't know if what's
20	not in the claims would work for treprostinil,
21	correct?
22	A. I wouldn't purport to provide
23	a clinical or technical opinion on that, no.
24	THE WITNESS: Maybe now would be a
25	good time for a break?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 63 of 297

	Page 64
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	MR. DELAFIELD: Sure.
3	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
4	10:52 a.m. This is the end of media 1. We are
5	off the record.
6	(WHEREUPON, a recess was had at
7	10:52 a.m. until 11:03 a.m.)
8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now
9	11:03 a.m. This is the beginning of media 2.
10	We are back on the record.
11	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
12	Q. Welcome back.
13	A. Thank you.
14	(WHEREUPON, the documents were
15	tendered to the witness.)
16	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
17	Q. I have handed you four
18	exhibits. The first being Exhibit 1162 for IPR
19	2017-01622 which is a Substantive Submission
20	Under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.114 part of the
21	prosecution history for the '507 patent.
22	The second exhibit I have
23	handed you is Exhibit 1163 for IPR 2017-01622
24	which is Supplement Amendment and Reply Under
25	37 CFR 1.111 also from the '507 patent

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 64 of 297

Page 65 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 prosecution history. Let's start with those 3 two. 4 Do you recognize these 5 documents? 6 Α. I do, yes. 7 Did you review these documents 0. 8 in preparing your declaration? 9 Α. Yes. 10 0. The last two exhibits you have been handed are Exhibit 1162 for IPR 2017-01621 11 12 which is also entitled Substantive Submission 13 Under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.114 and is part of 14 the prosecution history for the '240 patent, and Exhibit 1163 for IPR 2017-01621 which is 15 16 entitled Supplement Amendment and Reply Under 17 37 CFR 1.111 which is also part of the 18 prosecution history for the '240 patent. 19 Are you familiar with these 20 two documents? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. And did you review these two 23 documents in preparation of your declaration? 24 Α. Yes. 25 Okay. I wanted to hand you 0.

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 65 of 297

Page 66 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 all four because they are very similar, and so 3 we can go through probably two at a time. Ι 4 assume your answers will likely be the same 5 because they are very similar. So let's look at Exhibit 1162 for both cases if you kind of 6 7 have them side by side. 8 Α. Okay. 9 And if you turn to page 22 --0. 10 actually, sorry -- if you could turn to page 19 11 of both exhibits 1162. 12 Do you see this is the start 13 of the declaration under 37 C.F.R. Section 14 1.132 of Dr. Roham T. Zamanian. 15 Do you see that? 16 Α. Yes. 17 0. Now, if you could just briefly 18 look through his declaration until page 8 or 19 page 26 of the exhibit in both. I will let you take a second to look. 20 21 Α. Okay. 22 Q. Both declarations are very 23 similar, correct? 24 Α. They appear to be, yes. 25 And specifically if you look 0.

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 66 of 297

	Page 67
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	at page 22 starting paragraph 18, there's a
3	section called Commercial Success of Tyvaso.
4	Do you see that?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And that section is identical
7	between the two declarations, right?
8	A. I believe so, yes.
9	Q. So with that in mind, I am
10	just going to refer to Exhibit 1162 for the
11	01622 case, but you understand that my
12	questions are in reference to both cases
13	because we are talking about the exact same
14	disclosure.
15	Do you understand?
16	A. I do.
17	Q. Okay. So looking at Exhibit
18	1162 at page 19, paragraph 1 it says: "I,
19	Dr. Roham T. Zamanian, hereby declare I
20	received a Bachelor of Science and Doctor of
21	Medicine from the University of California
22	Irvine, where I also completed my intership,
23	residency, and a fellowship in pulmonary
24	medicine and critical care."
25	Do you see that?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 67 of 297

Page 68 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Yes. And through his declaration 3 0. 4 and attached CV, you would agree that he has 5 treated patients with pulmonary hypertension, 6 correct? 7 I don't see that here, but it Α. 8 seems plausible to me that that's true. 9 Did you review his CV in ο. 10 preparation for your declaration? 11 Α. Yes. 12 ο. And that indicates he was 13 involved in several clinical trials involving 14 pulmonary hypertension? 15 That may be true. I don't Α. 16 recall. 17 ο. You would agree that 18 Dr. Zamanian is familiar with the use of Tyvaso 19 in treating pulmonary hypertension based on his 20 declaration and CV, correct? 21 That's my understanding. Α. 22 Q. Now, turning to page 22 where 23 he starts the discussion of commercial success 24 of Tyvaso, at paragraph 18 he says: 25 "Interestingly, once Tyvaso entered the market,

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 68 of 297

	Page 69
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	it was clinically preferred to Venativs."
3	Do you have any reason to
4	disagree with that statement?
5	A. Well, I do disagree with his
6	explanation for that. As you can see in the
7	next sentence, that claim appears to be
8	supported by the graph on the following page
9	which is the graph showing a market share
10	calculated among U.S. inhaled prostacyclins
11	which I discuss in my expert report, and I
12	discuss the flaws in that presentation. So I
13	do disagree with how he is explaining it here.
14	Q. Well, I am asking specifically
15	do you have any reason to disagree that Tyvaso
16	was preferred to Venativs once it entered the
17	market?
18	A. Well, it's not clear what he
19	means by that. Does he mean preferred by
20	everybody, preferred by some patients,
21	preferred by some physicians? It's not
22	certainly not preferred by everyone.
23	Q. Well, in the graph it shows
24	that the market share increased for Tyvaso and
25	decreased for Venativs, correct, over time?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 69 of 297

Page 70 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Well, I see what the graph 3 purports to show. As I explain in my 4 declaration, I think it misrepresents the 5 market. You know, in particular this graph 6 makes it appear that Tyvaso is taking market 7 share from Venativs, but the data don't support 8 that claim. 9 If you look at Venativs sales 10 over time, they actually don't decrease very 11 much over that period. They are more flat, and 12 Tyvaso is competing with a broader set of 13 competitors. I think this misrepresents the 14 market. 15 I understand you have a 0. 16 different definition of what the market should 17 be, but in your declaration, you don't disagree 18 with the data itself presented in paragraphs 19 18, 19 of Zamanian's declaration, correct? Well, I don't believe the 20 Α. 21 underlying data supporting this graph was 22 provided. I don't know what it's based on. Ι 23 didn't calculate an alternative presentation of 24 this based on different data. 25 0. If you turn to your

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 70 of 297

Page 71 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 declaration Exhibit 1055 for the '507 patent 3 Attachment B-4. 4 Α. I'm there. 5 0. You provide revenues by year for Tyvaso and Venativs, correct? 6 7 Α. Yes. 8 Q. And so using those numbers, 9 you could have checked to see if the market 10 share analysis done by Dr. Zamanian is correct, 11 right? 12 Α. Well, for the reasons 13 discussed in my declaration, I don't view it as 14 correct, but if one wanted to try to create that graph with the data in Attachment B-4, one 15 16 could do that. 17 0. But you didn't do that? 18 Α. Correct, not as part of my 19 analysis. 20 0. So I understand that you have 21 a different analysis, but you don't have any 22 reason to doubt that the analysis he performed 23 is incorrect in terms of the facts presented, 24 correct? 25 Object to the form. MR. MATHAS:

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 71 of 297

	Page 72
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	BY THE WITNESS:
3	A. For my declaration, it's not
4	something I specifically evaluated, but just
5	eyeballing some of the figures here, they don't
6	appear to line up one for one with the graph.
7	For example, in 2013 if one were to perform
8	that calculation, it looks like you would get
9	less than 80 percent of the share between those
10	two drugs for Tyvaso with the sales being 119
11	for Venativs and 439 for Tyvaso. Yet here in
12	his graph he has greater than 80 percent for
13	Tyvaso. So, you know, you get different
14	results.
15	I don't know what figures his
16	data are based on whether it's units or
17	prescriptions or revenues. It doesn't line up
18	one for one, but I haven't sought to provide an
19	alternative based on these revenues not in my
20	declaration.
21	Q. To clarify, one difference I
22	just realized he is providing U.S. inhaled
23	prostacyclin market share.
24	Do you see that?
25	A. Yes.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 72 of 297

Page 73 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. And your Attachment B-4 is 3 sales throughout the world, correct? 4 Α. Yes, as reported by companies. 5 Q. So looking at your Attachment 6 B-4, you would agree that Tyvaso sales 7 increased from 2009 to 2014, correct? 8 Α. Yes. 9 And during that same time, ο. 10 Venativs sales roughly stayed the same, 11 correct? 12 Α. They have been roughly flat, 13 yes. 14 0. And you agree that Tyvaso and 15 Venativs are the only two inhaled treatments 16 for pulmonary hypertension, correct? 17 Α. To the best of my 18 recollection, yes. 19 So what are the clinical Ο. 20 benefits of Tyvaso over Venativs? 21 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 22 BY THE WITNESS: 23 Α. This is discussed in my 24 declaration in paragraphs 18 and 20. Ι 25 understand that patent owner has claimed some

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 73 of 297

	Page 74
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	differences in dosing regimen and delivery, and
3	I explain in paragraph 20 that based on the
4	opinions of Dr. Donovan, that those differences
5	relate to the differences between the
6	compounds between the two products and the
7	different half-lifes.
8	So in other words, the number
9	of times the patient takes each product is
10	different because the compounds have different
11	half-lifes.
12	Q. And those are the only
13	opinions you provided with respect to any
14	clinical benefit of Tyvaso over Venativs; is
15	that correct?
16	A. Those are the primary
17	opinions. Paragraph 18 provides the alleged
18	benefits by patent owner. Paragraph 20
19	explains them in context with respect to the
20	opinions of Dr. Donovan.
21	Q. Did you consider the rest of
22	Dr. Zamanian's opinions with respect to
23	clinical benefits of Tyvaso?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. So looking at 1162 at page 23,

800-642-1099

ſ

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 74 of 297

Page 75 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 paragraph 20, he states: "Because of the 3 pharmacodynamic differences between iloprost 4 and treprostinil, Tyvaso does not need to be 5 administered as frequently as Venativs, leading 6 to higher patient compliance." 7 Do you see that? Yes. 8 Α. 9 Do you agree with that 0. 10 statement? 11 Α. I don't have an agreement or 12 disagreement with it. 13 0. Do you have any reason to 14 disagree with it? 15 Not sitting here. It strikes Α. 16 me as a clinical opinion. 17 0. So we discussed how Dr. Zamanian was -- is an M.D. who focuses on 18 19 treatment of pulmonary hypertension, correct? 20 Α. That's my understanding. 21 Dr. Donovan is not an M.D., Q. right? 22 23 Α. I would have to go back and 24 refresh my memory. I don't recall sitting 25 here.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 75 of 297

	Page 76
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Q. I can represent she's not an
3	M.D.
4	Do you know if Dr. Donovan had
5	experience with treatments for pulmonary
6	hypertension before this case?
7	A. I don't recall.
8	Q. So why are you relying on
9	Dr. Donovan's opinion and not Dr. Zamanian's
10	opinion?
11	A. I am not seeking to provide an
12	opinion on any dispute between Dr. Zamanian and
13	Dr. Donovan. I am simply noting what
14	Dr. Donovan explains as an explanation for
15	those differences. Reading it as an economist,
16	Dr. Zamanian appears to agree based on what he
17	is writing here in terms of the half-life being
18	attributable to the different compounds, but I
19	am not seeking to provide an opinion on which
20	is correct and which is incorrect.
21	I simply provide the economic
22	implication of Dr. Donovan's clinical opinion
23	which is that there's no nexus between the
24	commercial performance and the
25	patents-at-issue.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 76 of 297

Page 77 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. But Dr. Zamanian specifically 3 says there is a nexus, correct? 4 Α. If you are looking at it, 5 could you point me to it? I don't see that 6 opinion looking through the Zamanian 7 declaration here. 8 ο. Actually, if you look at -- if 9 you turn to Exhibit 1163 starting at page 23, 10 and actually like we did for 1162, if you have 11 both versions of Exhibit 1163 open to page 23, 12 both the second declarations are roughly the 13 same. 14 Is that fair to say? 15 Α. They appear to be, yes. 16 And did you review these prior 0. 17 to your declaration? 18 Α. Yes. 19 So if you turn to paragraph 16 Ο. 20 which is on page 26 of Exhibit 1163, under 21 Commercial Success he states: "There is a 22 clear nexus between the commercial success of 23 Tyvaso and the technical features of the 24 pending claims, including the single event 25 dosing of 'from 15 micrograms to 90 micrograms

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 77 of 297

	Page 78
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	of treprostinil, ' the single inhalation event
3	of '18 or less breaths,' and the pulsed
4	ultrasonic nebulizer."
5	Do you see that?
6	A. I do.
7	Q. Did you consider that in
8	forming your opinions?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And so why do you credit
11	Dr. Donovan's opinion over Dr. Zamanian?
12	A. I'm not seeking to resolve any
13	dispute between those two experts. I am simply
14	relying on the opinion of Dr. Donovan in
15	explaining the economic implication of that.
16	So if Dr. Donovan is correct that differences
17	between Tyvaso and Venativs derives primarily
18	from differences between treprostinil and
19	iloprost rather than the alleged innovative
20	aspects of the patent-at-issue, then from an
21	economic perspective, there's no nexus between
22	the commercial performance of Tyvaso and the
23	patents-at-issue. So that's the opinion I am
24	providing.
25	Q. But Dr. Zamanian obviously
L	

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 78 of 297

	Page 79
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	disagrees with Dr. Donovan, and I am just
3	trying to understand what basis you have to
4	rely on Dr. Donovan over Dr. Zamanian.
5	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
6	BY THE WITNESS:
7	A. I would provide the same
8	answer. I am happy to try to do so again, but
9	it's the same answer.
10	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
11	Q. Now, sitting here today, you
12	said that you couldn't recall if Dr. Donovan
13	had any experience with pulmonary hypertension
14	or was a doctor, correct?
15	A. I just don't recall her
16	specific qualifications sitting here. I would
17	need to look at her declaration or CV.
18	Q. But you do know Dr. Zamanian
19	is an M.D. and treats pulmonary hypertension
20	and is obviously familiar with the use of
21	Tyvaso, correct?
22	A. He does appear to be an M.D.
23	based on what we have looked at. I don't know
24	the extent to which he personally treats PAH or
25	not.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 79 of 297

	Page 80
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Q. If you look at paragraph 5 of
3	Exhibit 1163, he says: "Prior to consulting
4	for United Therapeutics, I was a principal
5	investigator in the 'Aspire' registry comparing
6	the incidence of respiratory tract adverse
7	events in patients treated with United
8	Therapeutics' product Tyvaso with other FDA
9	approved pulmonary hypertension therapies."
10	Do you see that?
11	A. I do.
12	Q. So he was involved with
13	patients treated with Tyvaso, correct?
14	A. It appears so based on this
15	information.
16	Q. So what basis do you have to
17	conclude that Dr. Donovan is right with respect
18	to her statement regarding the nexus and
19	Dr. Zamanian is wrong with his statement
20	regarding the nexus?
21	A. Well, in an evaluation of
22	nexus, the idea is to connect the commercial
23	performance to the alleged innovative aspects
24	of the patents-at-issue. I can see what
25	Dr. Zamanian has done.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 80 of 297

Page 81
DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
He says that Tyvaso has been
clinically preferred to Venativs because of its
clinical advantages, but in his analysis in
these exhibits that we have reviewed, he
doesn't appear to tie the commercial
performance to the patents-at-issue. He, in
fact, attributes the difference in performance
to things that are not claimed.
And so I explain Dr. Donovan's
opinion in that regard from a clinical
perspective. I am not seeking to resolve a
dispute between Dr. Zamanian and Dr. Donovan,
but I do rely on Dr. Donovan and explain the
economic implication of that.
Q. In Exhibit 1163 on page 26, we
just discussed paragraph 16. He states:
"There is a clear nexus between the commercial
success of Tyvaso and the technical features of
the pending claims, including the single event
dosing of 'from 15 micrograms to 90 micrograms
of treprostinil,' the single event of '18 or
less breaths, ' and the pulsed ultrasonic
nebulizer."
Do you see that?

Γ

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 81 of 297

Page 82 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. I do. 3 0. And so he is pointing specifically to claimed features of the patent 4 5 and not the drug substance as contributing or a 6 nexus to the commercial success of Tyvaso, 7 correct? 8 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 9 BY THE WITNESS: 10 Α. In this paragraph he appears 11 to be making a claim of nexus to the subject 12 matter. In the previous Exhibit 1162 he does 13 not appear to. 14 BY MR. DELAFIELD: Do you have any reason to 15 0. 16 disagree with paragraph 16 in Exhibit 1163? 17 Α. Yes, I do. That's explained 18 in my declarations. I would be happy to try to 19 summarize it for you. 20 0. Is your disagreement just based on the fact that Dr. Donovan said 21 something different than what is said here? 22 23 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 24 BY THE WITNESS: 25 It is not based just on that, Α.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 82 of 297

	Page 83
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	no.
3	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
4	Q. You do not provide any
5	evidence in your declaration that demonstrates
6	that paragraph 16 is incorrect, right?
7	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
8	BY THE WITNESS:
9	A. I don't agree with that.
10	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
11	Q. Can you point me to anything
12	in your declaration that specifically discusses
13	why there's no nexus to the claim limitations
14	of single event dosing from 15 micrograms to 90
15	micrograms of treprostinil and the single
16	inhalation event of 18 or less breaths and
17	pulsed ultrasonic nebulizer?
18	A. Sure. This is a large part of
19	what my declaration is about. If you turn to
20	page 13 of Exhibit 1055 from the 1622 case, you
21	will see Section C there Alleged commercial
22	success based on a flawed evaluation of nexus.
23	That's in paragraphs 18, 19, 20, and 21.
24	In addition, if you go to page
25	18 of the same document, you will see the

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 83 of 297

	Page 84
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	section header Section E Low or no economic
3	relevance of alleged commercial success, and
4	you can see paragraphs 26 through 37 where I
5	provide a valuation of nexus between commercial
6	performance of Tyvaso and the claimed subject
7	matter.
8	Q. Okay. My question was
9	specifically to those claim elements.
10	You don't provide any detail
11	as to why Dr. Zamanian is wrong in his
12	assessment of those specific claim elements
13	with respect to nexus, correct?
14	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
15	BY THE WITNESS:
16	A. I'm not sure what you mean by
17	that. My understanding is that Dr. Zamanian is
18	speaking to a potential nexus between
19	commercial performance of Tyvaso and the
20	aspects of the pending patent claims, and
21	that's what I have addressed in the paragraphs
22	I referenced in my previous response.
23	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
24	Q. But you don't address those
25	claim limitations, correct?
	D. 11. 11. W. 11. 11.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 84 of 297

	Page 85
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
3	BY THE WITNESS:
4	A. I don't agree with that.
5	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
6	Q. Can you show me anywhere in
7	your report where you discuss a dosing range of
8	15 micrograms to 90 micrograms or a single
9	inhalation event of 18 or less breaths?
10	A. I mean, I reference those in
11	summary form in paragraph 18 where I reference
12	the dosing regimen and the pulsed ultrasonic
13	nebulizer. Those are the claimed benefits set
14	forth by the patent owner, as I understand
15	them. Those are consistent with what
16	Dr. Zamanian has articulated as claimed
17	benefits.
18	Q. But you don't address whether
19	those claimed benefits provide a nexus to the
20	commercial success, correct?
21	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
22	BY THE WITNESS:
23	A. I don't agree with that.
24	That's what these paragraphs in my report are
25	about.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 85 of 297

Page 86 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 3 0. So let me put it another way. So the claims include several different 4 5 elements. 6 Do you agree with that? 7 That's my understanding. Α. 8 Q. And you have provided an 9 opinion that certain claim elements do not 10 contribute to -- strike that. That certain claim elements do 11 12 not provide a nexus to the commercial success 13 of Tyvaso. 14 Do you agree with that? 15 I am not sure what you mean by Α. 16 that. Could you point me to something specific 17 in my declaration? 18 Q. Well, in the paragraphs you 19 mentioned paragraphs 18 through 20. For 20 example, in paragraph 20 you reference 21 difference in commercial performance are 22 largely attributable to the drug substance 23 treprostinil. 24 Α. Yes. 25 But you don't address whether 0. David Feldman Worldwide 800-642-1099 A Veritext Company www.veritext.com

> UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 86 of 297

	Page 87
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	the other claim elements would provide a nexus
3	to the commercial success, right?
4	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
5	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
6	Q. Put it another way. You don't
7	do anything to rebut the statement made by
8	Dr. Zamanian in paragraph 16 where he claims
9	there's a nexus between the dosing and breaths
10	to commercial success specifically, right?
11	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
12	BY THE WITNESS:
13	A. I don't agree with that.
14	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
15	Q. Where do you address in terms
16	of nexus the dosing and number of breaths?
17	MR. MATHAS: Asked and answered.
18	BY THE WITNESS:
19	A. It's provided in the
20	paragraphs citations I gave to you earlier.
21	Paragraphs 18 to 21 and paragraphs 26 to 37 of
22	my declaration addressing nexus between the
23	claimed inventions and commercial performance
24	of Tyvaso, and specifically with respect to
25	clinical aspects of certain claim limitations.

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621

800-642-1099

Page 87 of 297

	Page 88
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	In paragraph 18 I put forward
3	the claimed clinical benefits of the
4	patents-in-suit as put forward by patent owner.
5	In paragraph 20 I explain that my understanding
6	that those clinical benefits are primarily
7	derived from aspects outside the claimed
8	invention.
9	Q. But you don't address dosing
10	and number of breaths specifically other than
11	to mention it in paragraph 18 with respect to
12	nexus to commercial success, correct?
13	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
14	BY THE WITNESS:
15	A. I do address it in the
16	paragraphs that I have referenced. I address
17	it by explaining other factors besides the
18	claimed innovative aspects that drive the
19	commercial performance of Tyvaso.
20	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
21	Q. And that's based on your
22	reliance on Dr. Donovan, correct?
23	A. Her declaration is one item
24	that I rely upon.
25	Q. For nexus, you rely on

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 88 of 297

	Page 89
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Dr. Donovan's opinion, correct?
3	A. Her declaration is one item I
4	rely upon. I also rely upon additional
5	information.
6	Q. With respect to whether the
7	technical aspects of the patents provide a
8	nexus to commercial success, what other
9	information besides Dr. Donovan do you rely
10	upon Dr. Donovan's declaration?
11	A. I can try to go through it in
12	summary form if that's helpful.
13	Q. Well, can you think of
14	anything off the top of your head?
15	A. Yes. Paragraph 19 where I
16	discuss other patents covering other aspects of
17	Tyvaso including the '075 patent and the '222
18	patent. In paragraph 21 I discuss evidence
19	related to marketing and the share of sales
20	representatives for Tyvaso and Venativs
21	relative to other products on the market.
22	In Section E in paragraph 27,
23	I explain the notion of blocking patents, and
24	in paragraph 28 I go over relevant blocking
25	patents here and explain the economic relevance

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

ſ

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 89 of 297

	Page 90
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	of that in that section.
3	In paragraph 31 I examine
4	information on UTC's history and focus on
5	pursuing PAH treatments. I examine information
6	on other companies not being interested in
7	pursuing the claimed in pursuing inhaled
8	treprostinil product, and in paragraphs 35
9	through 37, I rely on similar information as
10	Section C of my declaration.
11	So that's the information that
12	I have in mind that you keep asking about with
13	respect to what I examined in seeking to rebut
14	claims of nexus by patent owner and
15	Dr. Zamanian.
16	Q. Sir, I didn't ask for a
17	summary of your entire opinion. I asked
18	specifically with respect to the technical
19	aspects of the patents in this case and whether
20	or not those technical aspects provide a nexus
21	to commercial success.
22	You don't rely on anything
23	else besides Dr. Donovan's declaration with
24	respect to the technical aspects, correct?
25	A. I don't recall your previous

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 90 of 297

	Page 91
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	question being limited to technical aspects.
3	If it was, I apologize.
4	With regard to technical
5	aspects, I rely on my understanding of the
6	claimed invention and I rely on information
7	from Dr. Donovan that those are the main
8	sources that I rely upon for technical aspects.
9	Q. And why did you rely on
10	Dr. Donovan?
11	A. Because Dr. Donovan was
12	providing opinions that are relevant to an
13	economic nexus between the claimed inventions
14	and Tyvaso's commercial performance.
15	Q. But Dr. Zamanian also provided
16	opinions regarding nexus and commercial
17	performance, correct?
18	A. Yes, and I reviewed those as
19	well.
20	Q. But you rely on Dr. Donovan
21	and assume she is correct and likewise assume
22	Dr. Zamanian is incorrect?
23	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
24	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
25	Q. Is that fair to say?

ſ

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 91 of 297

	Page 92
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	MR. MATHAS: Same objection.
3	BY THE WITNESS:
4	A. I wouldn't describe it that
5	way. I would describe it as I have in my
6	previous responses.
7	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
8	Q. You disagree with
9	Dr. Zamanian, correct strike that.
10	You disagree with Dr. Zamanian
11	regarding his statement on the nexus between
12	Tyvaso and commercial success, correct?
13	A. Yes, that's right.
14	Q. But you agree with
15	Dr. Donovan's statement regarding a lack of
16	nexus between the patents and commercial
17	success of Tyvaso, correct?
18	A. I don't recall whether she
19	provides that specific opinion or conclusion on
20	nexus. She's providing clinical information or
21	clinical opinions that I rely upon, and then I
22	draw an opinion with respect to economic
23	connection or economic nexus.
24	Q. Well, she provides an opinion
25	on the technical aspects of for part of that
25	on the technical aspects of for part of tha

800-642-1099

ſ

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 92 of 297

	Page 93
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	nexus. So strike that.
3	So a nexus means a connection
4	between technical aspects and commercial
5	success.
6	Is that a fair description?
7	A. I wouldn't describe it that
8	way, no. It's related but I wouldn't summarize
9	it like that.
10	Q. You wouldn't describe a nexus
11	in this situation as finding a relationship
12	between the technical aspects of the patent to
13	the commercial success of the product of the
14	patent?
15	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
16	BY THE WITNESS:
17	A. It's related but it's not
18	exclusively limited to technical aspects. For
19	example, I examine information on marking. I
20	examine information on blocking patents. I
21	examine information on other market incentives.
22	Those are non-technical aspects that go towards
23	nexus. So I just mean to clarify that it's not
24	limited to technical aspects.
25	

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 93 of 297

Page 94 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 3 0. But for the technical aspects in this case, you rely on Dr. Donovan, correct? 4 5 Α. I do as well as my own 6 understanding of what the claimed technology 7 is. 8 Q. Do you have any reason to 9 believe why Dr. Donovan would know more or have 10 better experience with respect to the use of 11 Tyvaso to treat pulmonary hypertension than 12 Dr. Zamanian? 13 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 14 BY THE WITNESS: No, I have not sought to 15 Α. 16 provide that evaluation. 17 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 18 0. So why do you agree with 19 Dr. Donovan and disagree with Dr. Zamanian? 20 MR. MATHAS: Asked and answered. 21 BY THE WITNESS: 22 Α. I'm not seeking to resolve a 23 dispute between them or decide who is more 24 credible. I am simply relying on Dr. Donovan 25 in explaining economic implications of that,

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 94 of 297

	Page 95
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	and I view the opinions that she is providing
3	here in paragraph 20 of my declaration and
4	elsewhere as consistent with some of the
5	information that Dr. Zamanian puts forward that
6	clinical advantages of Tyvaso over Venativs
7	appear to relate to the difference between the
8	compounds.
9	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
10	Q. But they clearly disagree on
11	whether or not there's a nexus between the
12	commercial success of Tyvaso and the technical
13	features of the claims, correct?
14	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
15	BY THE WITNESS:
16	A. I would defer to Dr. Donovan
17	for any opinions she has on nexus.
18	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
19	Q. Did you have any input in
20	terms of identifying a technical aspect
21	expert in this case?
22	A. No.
23	Q. So you were provided
24	Dr. Donovan's opinion and told to rely upon it,
25	correct?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 95 of 297

Page 96 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 MR. MATHAS: I am going to object 3 to the form. Also whatever he would be told by 4 counsel would be privileged. Maybe you can 5 rephrase the question in a way that's not 6 objectionable if possible. 7 Are you asking what his counsel 8 told him? 9 MR. DELAFIELD: No, I am not 10 seeking privileged information. 11 MR. MATHAS: Maybe move on or ask 12 it differently then, please. 13 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 14 0. You are not a clinician, 15 correct? 16 Α. That's right. I am an 17 economist. 18 ο. And you are not a technical 19 expert with respect to pulmonary hypertension 20 or inhaled devices, correct? 21 Α. No. 22 Q. So sitting here today, you 23 don't have a reason to know whether Dr. Donovan 24 is correct in her analysis of nexus or whether 25 Dr. Zamanian is correct in his analysis of

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 96 of 297

	Page 97
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	nexus, correct?
3	MR. MATHAS: Asked and answered.
4	BY THE WITNESS:
5	A. I don't recall what specific
6	conclusions Dr. Donovan is drawing with respect
7	to nexus. I don't rely on her conclusion of
8	nexus or no nexus. I simply rely on her
9	conclusions on clinical aspects of what's
10	driving differences between Tyvaso and
11	Venativs, and I use that information as part of
12	my analysis and evaluation of economic nexus.
13	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
14	Q. For Dr. Zamanian's opinion
15	regarding nexus, given that you are not a
16	technical expert, you have no reason sitting
17	here today to believe that that opinion is
18	incorrect, right?
19	MR. MATHAS: Asked and answered.
20	BY THE WITNESS:
21	A. What is your question?
22	There's multiple parts there.
23	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
24	Q. Other than the fact
25	Dr. Donovan has provided different opinions

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 97 of 297

DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. regarding the alleged connection between the claims and commercial success, you don't have any opinion as to whether Dr. Zamanian's opinion regarding nexus is incorrect?
claims and commercial success, you don't have any opinion as to whether Dr. Zamanian's opinion regarding nexus is incorrect?
any opinion as to whether Dr. Zamanian's opinion regarding nexus is incorrect?
opinion regarding nexus is incorrect?
그 같은 것 같은
A. I don't agree with that.
Q. But you don't describe his
opinions other than the chart comparing market
share in your declaration, correct?
MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
BY THE WITNESS:
A. I don't agree with that. They
are also described in summary form in paragraph
18 where I describe the alleged clinical
advantages as put forth by patent owner.
BY MR. DELAFIELD:
Q. So you do rebut some of what
Dr. Zamanian has presented in the prosecution
of both patents, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But specifically you don't
provide a rebuttal to paragraph 16 where he
addresses nexus specifically?
MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 98 of 297

Page 99 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 BY THE WITNESS: 3 Α. I don't agree with that. 4 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 5 0. Other than paragraph 18 that 6 we have discussed a few times now mentioning 7 dosing and number of breaths, you don't 8 specifically address dosing or number of 9 breaths with respect to nexus in your 10 declaration, correct? 11 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 12 BY THE WITNESS: I don't agree. 13 Α. Those are also 14 discussed in paragraphs 20 and paragraphs 35 and 36 and 37. 15 16 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 17 Q. So let's start with paragraph 20. 18 19 Where in paragraph 20 does it 20 talk about dosing or number of breaths? 21 Α. Where it's talking about the 22 alleged innovative aspects of the 23 patents-in-suit. 24 0. But that does not specifically 25 say dosing or number of breaths, correct?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 99 of 297

Page 100 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Correct, but those are among 3 the innovative aspects as alleged as I 4 understand it. 5 0. So I am asking you 6 specifically is there any other place -- strike 7 that. 8 Other than in paragraph 18 9 with respect to nexus, you do not address 10 specifically the number of breaths or dosing of 11 Tyvaso, correct? 12 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 13 BY THE WITNESS: 14 Α. I don't know how else to 15 answer it other than the previous responses I 16 have provided to you. 17 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 18 ο. Well, I am asking specifically 19 where do you talk about those in specific 20 detail, not a summary of alleged innovative 21 aspects? 22 I will give you one example in Α. 23 paragraph 35 where I discuss clinical 24 contributions -- quote: "Clinical 25 contributions of alleged novel device and

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 100 of 297

	Page 101
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	dosing regimen are limited and that, by
3	contrast, the vast majority of the clinical
4	benefit of Tyvaso comes from the treprostinil
5	compound itself and the application of that
6	compound to treating PAH" end quote.
7	That's one example in one of
8	the paragraphs that I referenced.
9	Q. But that doesn't address the
10	specific claim elements that Dr. Zamanian
11	addresses being the specific dosing and number
12	of breaths, correct?
13	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
14	BY THE WITNESS:
15	A. Well, dosing regimen is
16	specifically there in the excerpt I just read,
17	and clinical contributions of the novel device,
18	as I think about that, that's related to the
19	number of breaths and how it's administered.
20	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
21	Q. Going back to the analysis
22	comparing Venativs and Tyvaso that Dr. Zamanian
23	performed, to clarify, Venativs and Tyvaso are
24	the only two inhaled pulmonary hypertension
25	therapies on the market, correct?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 101 of 297

Page 102 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. To the best of my recollection, that's true. 3 4 Q. And Venativs and Tyvaso both 5 use stable prostacyclin analogs, right? 6 Α. That may be true. That 7 question seems more directed toward a clinician 8 than an economist. 9 So you don't know? ο. 10 Α. That may be right, but in 11 terms of the technical terminology, I would 12 defer to a clinician to provide opinions on 13 that. 14 0. And when you say clinician, 15 what do you mean by that? 16 Here I am referring to someone Α. 17 that is gualified to provide opinions or information on clinical or technical aspects 18 19 using the term broadly just to describe someone 20 with technical expertise. 21 Clinicians are typically 0. 22 medical doctors, right? 23 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 24 BY THE WITNESS: 25 It's commonly used that way. Α.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 102 of 297

Page 103 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 In this context I'm trying to refer to someone 3 with technical expertise. 4 Are you aware if Dr. Donovan Q. has any clinical experience? 5 6 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 7 BY THE WITNESS: Sitting here, I don't recall. 8 Α. 9 I would have to look at her CV or I would defer 10 to Dr. Donovan for that question. 11 (WHEREUPON, documents were 12 tendered to the witness.) 13 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 14 0. So you have been handed what has been marked as Exhibit 1140 which is a copy 15 16 of the Tyvaso label, and it's Exhibit 1140 in 17 both cases. 18 Do you recognize this 19 document? 20 Α. Did you mean to hand me a copy 21 of a 1140? I have a copy of 1160 and a copy of 22 1140. 23 Yeah, I was talking about Q. 24 1140. 25 Okay. You handed me two Α.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 103 of 297

Page 104 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 documents. 3 0. Yeah, I was going to get to 1160. 4 Okay. I see Exhibit 1140. 5 Α. 6 Are you familiar with this Q. 7 document? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Now earlier I asked if ο. 10 Ventavis and Tyvaso were prostacyclins. 11 Under Indications and Usage at 12 the top it says: "Tyvaso is a prostacyclin 13 vasodilator." 14 Do you see that? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Q. So you agree Tyvaso is a 17 prostacyclin? 18 Α. Yes, I agree with that. 19 Then looking at 1160, which is Q. 20 a copy of the label for Venativs, it's Exhibit 1160 in both cases. 21 22 Are you familiar with this 23 document? 24 Α. Yes, it appears to be the 25 Venativs label.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 104 of 297

Page 105 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. And at the top left under 3 Indications and Usage it says: "Venativs is a 4 synthetic analog of prostacyclin." 5 Do you see that? 6 Α. Yes. 7 So both Venativs and Tyvaso 0. 8 are prostacyclin or prostacyclin analogs, 9 correct? 10 Α. I agree with that. 11 And Venativs and Tyvaso are ο. 12 both approved for the same indication, correct? 13 They are not identical. You Α. 14 can see here in the two exhibits that they 15 don't have identical language on indication, 16 but they both do generally relate to treatment 17 of pulmonary arterial hypertension. 18 0. So they are both used to treat 19 NYHA Functional Class III symptoms of pulmonary 20 hypertension, correct? 21 That appears to be accurate Α. 22 looking at these indications, yes. 23 Now, if you look under Dosage 0. 24 and Administration on that first page, the 25 dosages differ between Venativs and Tyvaso,

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 105 of 297

	Page 106
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	correct?
3	A. They appear to, yes.
4	Q. So keeping that open, if you
5	turn back to your declaration at paragraph 37,
6	in paragraph 37 you state: "I understand from
7	Dr. Donovan that the less frequent treatment
8	with Tyvaso relates to treprostinil's longer
9	half-life relative to iloprost rather than any
10	differences in the way the Venativs and Tyvaso
11	are delivered via inhalation."
12	Do you see that?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Why does circulatory half-life
15	matter?
16	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
17	BY THE WITNESS:
18	A. I would defer to Dr. Donovan
19	for a technical description of that. My
20	understanding is that if the half-life is
21	longer, it has to be administered less
22	frequently to have similar coverage.
23	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
24	Q. So do iloprost and
25	treprostinil exert their effect on pulmonary

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 106 of 297

DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
pertension based on circulating through the
ood or based on direct action in the lungs
ere they deposited after inhalation?
MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
THE WITNESS:
A. That strikes me as a clinical
estion. I don't have an opinion on that
tting here.
MR. DELAFIELD:
Q. Well, you understand that both
ugs are inhaled directly into the lungs,
rrect?
A. Yes.
Q. And they strike that.
They do make their way to the
oodstream, but they first enter the lungs and
e deposited there, correct?
A. That's consistent with my
derstanding, yes.
Q. And so I am just trying to
derstand whether you understand what
. Donovan meant by half-life and why it
tters in this context.
A. Okay.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 107 of 297

Page 108 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. Do you -- can you explain why 3 circulatory half-life matters in this context? 4 MR. MATHAS: Asked and answered. 5 BY THE WITNESS: 6 Α. I would defer to Dr. Donovan 7 on specific technical aspects of that. Yet my 8 understanding is that if a drug has a longer 9 half-life, it remains effective in the body for 10 a longer period of time and, thus, less 11 frequent administration needs to occur in order 12 to have effective treatment in the body. 13 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 14 ο. Do you know if that's the case 15 for inhaled therapies? 16 Α. That's my understanding 17 sitting here. Yet it does strike me as a 18 clinical question or a technical question. 19 Because it's a technical Q. 20 question, you don't know, correct? 21 You know, these are questions Α. 22 about technical or clinical aspects, and you 23 are asking for my understanding, and I give you 24 my understanding, and then when you follow up 25 and say, well, are you sure, are you sure that

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 108 of 297

	Page 109
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	that's correct, well, it's my understanding as
3	an economist, but it's not my area of
4	expertise. So I can't give you full
5	confirmation that it's correct.
6	Q. Would it change your opinion
7	if Dr. Donovan was incorrect about her opinion
8	regarding half-life and the reason for less
9	frequent treatment?
10	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
11	BY THE WITNESS:
12	A. I don't know. I would have to
13	give that some thought. I don't have an
14	opinion on it sitting here.
15	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
16	Q. So more generally if
17	Dr. Donovan was incorrect in her opinions
18	regarding the reasoning for less frequent
19	treatment with Tyvaso, you can't say that that
20	would not change your opinion with respect to
21	nexus?
22	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
23	BY THE WITNESS:
24	A. I just am not aware of what a
25	different opinion would look like from

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 109 of 297

	Page 110
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Dr. Donovan. As I review Dr. Zamanian's
3	declaration sitting here, he acknowledges the
4	difference in half-life between the two
5	compounds. He acknowledges that the longer
6	half-life of Tyvaso allows for less frequent
7	administration. So regardless of the mechanism
8	through which that occurs, it seems like
9	Dr. Donovan and Dr. Zamanian both agree on that
10	point.
11	I don't know how my opinion
12	would change if there were some nuance that was
13	incorrect. It would depend I suppose.
14	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
15	Q. The declaration you are
16	referring to from Dr. Zamanian with respect to
17	half-life, he doesn't discuss nexus, correct?
18	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
19	BY THE WITNESS:
20	A. Well, as I understand it, this
21	information from Dr. Zamanian is supposed to go
22	towards nexus. As we talked about, he doesn't
23	use the word nexus in this declaration that I
24	am referring to. This is Exhibit 1162 of case
25	1622. But my understanding is that this does

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621

800-642-1099

Page 110 of 297

	Page 111
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	go towards nexus. That's the purpose behind
3	it.
4	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
5	Q. Well, the only time he
6	actually uses the word nexus is in Exhibit 1163
7	discussing the dosing and number of breaths,
8	correct?
9	A. He does discuss nexus there.
10	I don't know if that's the only time he
11	discusses it.
12	Q. Well, earlier you looked
13	through 1162 and said that you don't see any
14	discussion of nexus.
15	Do you recall that?
16	A. I don't recall that being my
17	testimony. I indicated he didn't draw a
18	conclusion with respect to nexus which I agree.
19	I haven't seen that conclusion here in 1162,
20	but this information goes towards a connection
21	or a nexus between aspects of Tyvaso and
22	commercial performance.
23	Q. The only declaration on which
24	he does draw a conclusion specifically about
25	nexus is in 1163, correct?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 111 of 297

	Page 112
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
3	BY THE WITNESS:
4	A. I don't know if there are
5	other declarations out there, but of the two
6	that we have looked at today, that's the one
7	where I see him drawing a conclusion and using
8	the word nexus. I agree with that.
9	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
10	Q. If we can look back at your
11	declaration Exhibit 1055 at paragraph 16, you
12	state that in paragraph 16: "The purported
13	market share is among only the two inhaled
14	products on the market, and is overstated and
15	underrepresentative of competition in this
16	market because it omits relevant competing
17	products."
18	Do you see that?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And according to you, the
21	market for Tyvaso competes with several other
22	products besides Venativs; is that correct?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Does it compete with all other
25	medications that treat pulmonary hypertension?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 112 of 297

	Page 113
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	A. Yes. It's a matter of degree,
3	of course.
4	Q. So looking back at paragraph
5	11, you say: "Patients diagnosed with
6	pulmonary hypertension have several treatment
7	options, including medications and surgery.
8	Treatments for pulmonary hypertension include
9	anticoagulants, digoxin, diuretics, and calcium
10	channel blockers among others."
11	Do you see that?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Several of those you don't
14	include in your market for competition with
15	Tyvaso, correct?
16	A. Maybe you could be more
17	specific. I am not sure what you are referring
18	to.
19	Q. Well, earlier I asked does it
20	compete with all other medications that treat
21	pulmonary hypertension, and you said, yes, it's
22	a matter of degree, of course, and so I am
23	asking why did you not include the list of
24	treatments in Exhibit 11 in your market
25	analysis?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 113 of 297

Page 114 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. I'm not seeking to omit 3 specific drugs that would be applicable. I've 4 based my list of drugs based on products I know 5 to be approved for pulmonary arterial 6 hypertension, and specifically those that are 7 listed in third-party market research reports 8 as comprising the PAH market as well as 9 identified by UTC as competitors in their form 10 10-Ks. I would note that this 11 12 specific sentence is related to pulmonary 13 hypertension and not specifically pulmonary 14 arterial hypertension. So perhaps that's one 15 item that's driving the difference --16 What is the difference --0. 17 Α. -- but I am not seeking to 18 exclude relevant products. 19 What is the difference between Q. 20 pulmonary hypertension and pulmonary arterial 21 hypertension? 22 Α. Pulmonary arterial 23 hypertension is known as Group I. Pulmonary 24 hypertension that's described in the previous 25 paragraph so it relates to a subset of

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 114 of 297

	Page 115
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	pulmonary hypertension.
3	Q. Do you know what the technical
4	difference between pulmonary arterial
5	hypertension and pulmonary hypertension is?
6	A. Well, my understanding as just
7	explained is that pulmonary arterial
8	hypertension is a subset of pulmonary
9	hypertension. It's Group I. The world
10	class the World Health Organization has
11	different groups associated with pulmonary
12	hypertension, and PAH is one of those groups.
13	Q. So I guess to step back a
14	second. There's different types of pulmonary
15	hypertension, correct?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And there are different
18	treatments for different types of pulmonary
19	hypertension, correct?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And because of that, not all
22	products used to treat pulmonary hypertension
23	necessarily compete with Tyvaso such as
24	digoxin, correct?
25	A. That's right. I haven't seen
	David Feldman Worldwide

A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

Γ

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 115 of 297

Page 116 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 evidence of that competition. 3 Did you look to see if digoxin 0. is approved for use in pulmonary hypertension? 4 5 Α. I don't recall specifically 6 doing that, no. 7 Turning back to paragraph 16, 0. 8 and under 16a you report a quote from UTC's CEO 9 on an earnings call from 2010. 10 Do you see that? 11 Α. Yes. 12 0. And that's in support of your 13 statement that substantial evidence indicates 14 competition between Tyvaso and non-inhaled PAH 15 therapies and then, for example? 16 Α. Yes. 17 ο. Now, how long after the launch 18 of Tyvaso was that statement made? 19 It appears to be in the Α. 20 following year. Tyvaso was launched in 2009. This statement is from 2010. 21 22 Q. It's Q2, 2010, right? 23 Α. Yes. 24 So Tyvaso I believe was 0. 25 launched in July of 2009. I could be wrong,

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 116 of 297

	Page 117
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	but so likely less than a full year, correct?
3	A. Almost a year is probably a
4	good guess from July through what would be the
5	end of the second quarter. That would be June
6	or July of the next year.
7	Q. And in this statement it says
8	that many new patients switched to Tyvaso from
9	oral therapies, correct?
10	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
11	BY THE WITNESS:
12	A. I don't see that excerpt, but
13	I see that notion here in substance.
14	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
15	Q. Well, if you look at page 10
16	starting with: "And then the majority, the
17	large majority, around 70 percent come on to
18	our therapy after not really achieving the
19	results desired with either oral or more
20	commonly dual oral therapies."
21	Do you see that?
22	A. Yes, that's what I was
23	referring to as well.
24	Q. So in total in this first year
25	if you add up the percentages listed, roughly

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 117 of 297

Page 118
DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
90 percent of patients taking Tyvaso switched
to Tyvaso from a different pulmonary
hypertension medicine, correct?
MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
BY THE WITNESS:
A. I'm not sure I follow. It
appears here he is describing all of the other
medications from which Tyvaso patients
originate.
BY MR. DELAFIELD:
Q. Yes, that's what I meant. So
the statement says 10 percent of patients come
on Tyvaso from parenteral therapies, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And about 20 percent of
patients, maybe a little bit more than 20
percent come on to a therapy from Venativs,
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And 70 percent come on to our
therapy after not really achieving the results
desired in either oral or more commonly dual
oral therapies, correct?
A. Correct.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 118 of 297

Page 119 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. So if you add up those 3 percentages, 90 percent of Tyvaso patients in 4 the first year switched from another pulmonary 5 hypertension drug to Tyvaso, correct? 6 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 7 BY THE WITNESS: 8 Α. I may be missing your point, 9 but 70 percent plus 20 percent plus 10 percent 10 is the full 100 percent. 11 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 12 0. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I 13 meant 90 percent came from Venativs or oral 14 therapies, correct? 15 Α. Yes. 16 0. And so you agree 20 percent 17 switched from Venativs to Tyvaso according to this statement, correct? 18 19 Α. That appears to be what this 20 statement is saying. 21 So Tyvaso took market share Q. 22 from Venativs, correct? 23 That may be true to some Α. 24 degree in the first year. Venativs sales didn't decline very much, just 8 million in 25

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 119 of 297

Page 120 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 2009 to 2010. So perhaps to a small degree, 3 that's true. 4 Q. Venativs was approved in 2004, 5 correct? 6 If you need to look at Exhibit 7 1160 the label for Venativs in the upper left, 8 it says initial U.S. approval 2004. 9 Α. I see that, yes. 10 Q. And Tyvaso was approved in 11 2009, correct? 12 Α. Yes. 13 And as we have stated before, 0. 14 those are the only two inhaled therapies for 15 pulmonary hypertension, correct? 16 Α. That's my understanding, yes. 17 0. In terms of pharmaceutical 18 sales, have you heard of first mover advantage? 19 Α. I have heard of the term 20 generally, yes. 21 Can you tell me your Q. 22 understanding of that? 23 First mover advantage is a Α. 24 term that describes customer recognition of the 25 first product on the market and the advantages

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 120 of 297

Page 121 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 associated with that. 3 0. What are those advantages? 4 Α. The advantages with respect to 5 competition. Customer recognition is a good 6 thing for competition in the market. 7 So basically if you are the 0. 8 first on the market, everyone knows about --9 strike that. 10 If you are the first on the 11 market, you are the only drug that people know 12 about, and you have no competition, right, for 13 that specific treatment? 14 Α. For the period of time where 15 you are the only product on the market. Of 16 course, you would still call something a first 17 mover once additional competition comes on to 18 the market. 19 Would you agree that a second ο. 20 market entrant in the same market segment may 21 face a greater challenge to gain market share? 22 Α. That may be true. It depends 23 on the situation. Sometimes a second mover can 24 have the advantage that a certain type of 25 therapy or practice has been established, and

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 121 of 297

	Page 122
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	they benefit positively from that. So it just
3	depends on the situation.
4	Q. Did you look to see if that
5	was the case in this case?
6	A. I am not sure what you mean.
7	I am aware that Venativs was launched before
8	Tyvaso if that's what you mean.
9	Q. You don't provide any opinions
10	about whether it was an advantage or
11	disadvantage for Tyvaso to be the second market
12	entrant into inhaled treatment for pulmonary
13	hypertension, correct?
14	A. I don't view that as the
15	correct market definition. I wouldn't call
16	Tyvaso the second market entrant here.
17	Q. Well, assume for this question
18	I am just talking about the inhaled pulmonary
19	hypertension treatments as a market. You don't
20	provide any opinion about the fact that Tyvaso
21	was the second market entrant in that same
22	market, correct?
23	A. It would be odd for me to draw
24	an opinion on a market that I don't think is
25	correct or relevant, but I agree that I don't

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 122 of 297

	Page 123
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	focus on order of market entry between Tyvaso
3	and Venativs. I don't view it as particularly
4	impactful here.
5	Q. And you agree that Tyvaso has
6	performed better over time than Venativs in
7	terms of sales, correct?
8	A. It has had greater sales, yes.
9	Q. Now, moving to the other
10	pulmonary hypertension drugs that are not
11	inhaled that you included in your market
12	definition, earlier we also discussed there are
13	different stages of pulmonary arterial
14	hypertension, correct?
15	A. Groups I think they are
16	typically referred to. Is that what you mean?
17	Q. Yes, or well, actually
18	let's just if you look at the Venativs
19	label, for example, Exhibit 1160, under
20	Indications and Usage, the last sentence says:
21	"Studies establishing effectiveness included
22	predominantly patients with NYHA Functional
23	Class III to IV symptoms and etiologies of
24	idiopathic or heritable pulmonary arterial
25	hypertension or pulmonary arterial hypertension

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 123 of 297

Page 124 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 associated with connective tissue diseases." 3 Do you see that? 4 Α. Yes. 5 ο. So there's a couple things 6 So -- well, first, do you have an here. 7 understanding of what NYHA Functional Class 8 symptoms are? 9 Α. I presume they are just a 10 description of symptoms associated with the 11 disease. 12 0. Are you aware that there's 13 four classes of symptoms under that? 14 Α. That sounds right. 15 Is it your understanding that Q. 16 each class of symptoms -- strike that. 17 Is it your understanding that 18 pulmonary hypertension is a progressive 19 disease? 20 That sounds familiar. I don't Α. 21 recall specifically addressing that in my 22 declaration. 23 Is it your understanding that ο. 24 the class symptoms increase as the disease 25 progresses?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 124 of 297

	Page 125
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	A. That's consistent with my
3	experience.
4	Q. And so, for example, a patient
5	with Class I symptoms may be treated
6	differently than a patient with Class IV
7	symptoms, correct?
8	A. That may be true. It's not
9	something I have specifically evaluated in my
10	declaration or opined about.
11	Q. So you don't know if patients
12	with different class symptoms are treated
13	differently with different medications?
14	A. There may be some nuances with
15	respect to treatment. Some options may be more
16	effective for patients at various difference
17	classes. It's not a distinction that was in
18	the evidence when evaluating the relevant
19	market. So it's not something that I focused
20	on.
21	Q. You have said it's not in the
22	evidence that you evaluated?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. If you turn to your
25	declaration Exhibit 1055 for the '507 patent

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 125 of 297

Page 126 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 with the exhibits attached, and if you look at Attachment B-8 Competing PAH Therapies. 3 4 Α. Yes. 5 0. So, for example, the first 6 drug Remodulin lists effectiveness for patients 7 with Class II to IV symptoms. 8 Do you see that? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. And Tyvaso is only listed for 11 patients with Class III symptoms, correct? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Adcirca is for patients with 0. 14 Class II to III symptoms, correct? 15 I see that, yes. Α. 16 0. So without going through all 17 of these, each of these drugs have their own 18 uses in terms of patients with certain types of 19 symptoms -- strike that. 20 Each of these drugs are used 21 for patients with certain types of symptoms, 22 correct? 23 Yes, the indications are not Α. 24 identical. They all relate to pulmonary 25 arterial hypertension. Tyvaso has a narrower

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 126 of 297

Page 127
DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
label. In other words, it's useful in fewer
patients, and so it's a more limited commercial
opportunity.
Q. Did you account for the fact
that other pulmonary hypertension drugs were
listed for patients with wider variety of
symptoms?
A. Yes, that's reflected in the
sales data where a product that has
applicability to a wider set of patients
because of a broader or narrower indication is
able to achieve more sales. So comparison of
sales is where that is manifested in the
economic data.
Q. If a drug is only used to
treat specific symptoms, isn't it fair to
compare only other drugs that treat those same
symptoms?
MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
BY THE WITNESS:
A. No, not in my opinion. That's
not correct here.
BY MR. DELAFIELD:
Q. Why is that?

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 127 of 297

Page 128 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Because that's the incorrect 3 way to think about competition here. They 4 have -- there are a number of products 5 competing for PAH sales, and they have 6 different attributes and different coverage and 7 different effectiveness, but it's the broader 8 competition that tells you about the market 9 opportunity for treating pulmonary arterial 10 hypertension. Drug submarkets or segments with 11 respect to symptoms is not something that's 12 appropriate or consistent with what I have 13 reviewed. 14 THE WITNESS: And we have been 15 going for a while. Maybe at some point we 16 should break for lunch. 17 MR. DELAFIELD: Do you have lunch 18 here yet? 19 MR. MATHAS: It should be here. MR. DELAFIELD: Yeah, we can take a 20 21 break. 22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 23 12:35 p.m. This is the end of media 2. We are 24 off the record. 25

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 128 of 297

	Page 129
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	(WHEREUPON, a recess was had at
3	12:35 p.m. until 1:26 p.m.)
4	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now
5	1:26 p.m. This is the beginning of media 3.
6	We are back on the record.
7	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
8	Q. Welcome back.
9	A. Thank you.
10	Q. I think when we left, we were
11	talking about your declaration Exhibit 1055 for
12	the '507 patent and Attachment B-8, and we were
13	discussing how these different drugs have
14	different indications depending on what
15	symptoms they treat, correct?
16	A. Yes, I recall that.
17	Q. If you look at page 10 at
18	Adempas, and in the under Indication the
19	first bullet point says: "Persistent/recurrent
20	Chronic Thromboembolic Pulmonary Hypertension
21	after surgical treatment or inoperable (CTEPH)
22	to improve exercise capacity and WHO functional
23	class."
24	Do you see that?
25	A. Yes.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 129 of 297

Page 130 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. And then separately it's also 3 indicated for pulmonary arterial hypertension 4 to improve exercise capacity, improve WHO 5 functional class and to delay clinical 6 worsening. 7 Do you see that? 8 Α. Yes. 9 So just as an example, Adempas ο. 10 is specifically prescribed for chronic 11 thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension, correct? 12 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 13 BY THE WITNESS: 14 Α. That's part of the indication. 15 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 16 0. And Tyvaso is not prescribed 17 for that purpose, correct? 18 Α. It's not indicated for that, 19 that's right. 20 0. So at least for patients with 21 chronic thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension, 22 Tyvaso doesn't compete in the same market as 23 Adempas for that condition, correct? 24 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 25

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 130 of 297

1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	BY THE WITNESS:
3	A. I haven't seen evidence that
4	Tyvaso is prescribed for that. I haven't seen
5	evidence of it. I have not specifically
6	evaluated it, though.
7	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
8	Q. But you didn't account for the
9	differences in the indications for these drugs
0	being different than Tyvaso in your analysis of
1	the sales and revenue, correct?
2	A. I don't agree with that. The
3	differences in the indications are reflected in
4	the sales data. So if one drug has a slightly
5	more effective indication than another drug,
6	perhaps that drug has more sales. So it's one
7	of the inputs that is reflected in the economic
8	data.
9	Q. Well, I am talking about
0	indications not effectiveness. For example, if
1	a drug is indicated to treat three different
2	things strike that.
3	In your opinion if drug A is
4	indicated to treat three conditions and drug B
5	is indicated to treat just one of those three

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 131 of 297

	Page 132
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	conditions, would you say it's fair to compare
3	sales total sales of both drugs to each
4	other?
5	A. It depends on one's purpose.
6	Q. What do you mean by that?
7	A. Perhaps it would be fair in
8	some context but not fair in other context.
9	Q. Well, in this context there's
10	no indication that Tyvaso is used to treat
11	CTEPH, correct?
12	MR. MATHAS: Object to form.
13	BY THE WITNESS:
14	A. That's my understanding, yes.
15	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
16	Q. So sales of the Adempas to
17	treat that form of pulmonary hypertension do
18	not directly compete with sales of Tyvaso,
19	correct?
20	A. Again, I haven't seen evidence
21	that Tyvaso is prescribed for chronic
22	thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension. Perhaps
23	they don't compete for those prescriptions.
24	Looking through the rest of B-8 and the other
25	one, two, three 13 products here, I don't

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 132 of 297

	Page 133
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	see that as being a pervasive issue. It looks
3	specific to Adempas but none of the other
4	products on this list. So while that may be
5	true for Adempas, I don't view this to be an
6	impactful issue.
7	Q. Other than the separate
8	indication, each drug does have slightly
9	different functional class symptoms that they
LO	are designed to treat, correct?
.1	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
12	BY THE WITNESS:
.3	A. Some may be the same, but
4	there are frequently slight differences. Yes,
.5	I agree.
. 6	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
.7	Q. Are you aware that patients
8	taking strike that.
.9	Are you familiar with
0	Remodulin?
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And Remodulin is taken via IV
3	or subcutaneous, correct?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Do you understand that

Γ

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 133 of 297

	Page 134
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	Remodulin is primarily reserved for patients
3	with pulmonary hypertension that is an advanced
4	stage of pulmonary hypertension?
5	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
6	BY THE WITNESS:
7	A. I don't see that here in
8	Attachment B-8. It appears to be approved for
9	Classes II to IV symptoms. I don't recall
.0	whether it's reserved for advanced stage
1	sitting here.
2	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
3	Q. Let me ask it another way.
4	Can all patients with PAH use inhaled
5	formulations?
6	A. It probably depends on the
.7	patient.
8	Q. Well, I am asking if a patient
9	has pulmonary arterial hypertension, can they
0	use Tyvaso to help alleviate their symptoms no
1	matter what their symptoms are or how severe
2	their pulmonary hypertension is?
3	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
4	BY THE WITNESS:
25	A. They may be able to. There

800-642-1099

ſ

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 134 of 297

	Page 135
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	may be varying effectiveness of certain
3	medications on certain types of patients.
4	Physicians evaluate that on a case-by-case
5	basis. That's my understanding.
6	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
7	Q. Did you attempt to
8	differentiate the different forms of the drugs
9	in terms of when and how they are used with
10	patients?
11	A. I am aware of the different
12	forms. You can see that in the Form column on
13	Attachment B-8. So I am aware of those
14	differences across products.
15	Q. I guess I am trying to
16	understand your basis for your opinion that all
17	forms equally compete against Tyvaso for
18	treatment of pulmonary arterial hypertension.
19	I guess my question is if a
20	patient can't use a specific form of therapy,
21	it's not a choice to use one pulmonary
22	hypertension therapy over another, correct?
23	A. I am not sure I follow the
24	question. Could you ask it again?
25	Q. So let's take, for example, a

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

ſ

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 135 of 297

	Page 136
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	patient takes Orenitram which is an oral form
3	of treprostinil. Are with me?
4	A. Okay.
5	Q. And that pill doesn't work at
6	all for them, and then they take Tyvaso and it
7	does work. Would you say that those two
8	products still compete with respect to that
9	patient specifically?
10	A. Yes, I would. I think that
11	example illustrates the point which is that
12	patients have different options across
13	different forms, and some options may be more
14	effective for certain patients in certain
15	circumstances, and that's the market in which
16	the products compete. There are multiple
17	options, and what we examine in economic data
18	is which products are more successful within
19	that market.
20	Q. But each indication of all the
21	drugs listed in B-8 specify specifically what
22	class of symptoms they are designed to treat,
23	right?
24	A. Yes, but indications don't
25	need to be identical to be in the same relevant

800-642-1099

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 136 of 297

Page 137 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 market. 3 0. If you turn to Attachment B-8, the first page 8 Adcirca. 4 5 Do you see that? 6 Α. Yes. 7 And under Indication it says: 0. 8 "Adcirca is a phosphodiesterase 5 (PDE5) 9 inhibitor indicated for the treatment of 10 pulmonary arterial hypertension to improve 11 exercise ability." 12 Do you see that? 13 Α. Yes. 14 0. Did you account for any 15 differences in Adcirca or any of these drugs in 16 terms of the type of drug compared to Tyvaso? 17 Α. This is the same answer as 18 before. I did indirectly because that 19 manifests itself into the sales data. 20 Different drugs have different active 21 ingredients or classes of ingredients, and they 22 have different level of effectiveness. As a 23 result, that shows up in the economic data in 24 sales, and that's what I have examined. 25 If you turn back to paragraph 0.

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

www.veritext.com

800-642-1099

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 137 of 297

Page 138
DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
11 in your declaration and the last sentence
starting at page 5 states: "For the treatment
of PAH, in particular approved pharmaceuticals
target one of three major biochemical
pathways," and then it lists three pathways.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you understand each of
those pathways?
A. What do you mean by that?
Q. Well, can you explain to me
what an endothelin receptor antagonist is?
A. Well, I am an economist, not a
clinician, but my understanding is that it
targets the endothelin receptors. It's a class
of drugs that has that particular mechanism of
action.
Q. And what's an endothelin
receptor?
A. I don't recall specifically
sitting here.
Q. And for this paragraph, you
put footnote 3.
Do you see that?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 138 of 297

Page 139 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Yes. 3 0. And you don't cite Dr. Donovan 4 for that paragraph, correct? 5 Α. Correct. 6 0. So in general do these three 7 pathways treat pulmonary arterial hypertension 8 in different ways? 9 If you are asking for a Α. 10 clinical opinion, then that question is 11 probably better for a clinical or technical 12 expert. My understanding is that these are 13 different mechanism of action -- different 14 mechanisms of action that treat a similar set 15 of symptoms. 16 So patients have a similar set 17 of symptoms, and there are different classes of 18 products that have different mechanisms for 19 improving those symptoms and treating the 20 disease. So that's my understanding of how the 21 different pathways work as an economist. 22 Q. So for your economic analysis, 23 you didn't differentiate between these three 24 pathways in terms of what would and would not 25 compete with Tyvaso, correct?

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 139 of 297

Page 140 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. I am aware of these 3 differences. I took them into account by 4 analyzing the sales data, but I did not define 5 submarkets according to these distinctions. I 6 don't view that as appropriate or consistent 7 with the evidence I have seen. The evidence I 8 have seen supports competition across these 9 pathways. 10 Q. And so you don't know how 11 Tyvaso compares to other drugs that have the 12 same biochemical pathway, correct? 13 Α. I am not sure what you mean by 14 that. 15 You didn't do an analysis of Q. 16 the subgroups, correct? 17 Α. I did not create submarkets 18 based on these pathways, nor do I think that's 19 appropriate here. 20 0. And you didn't create 21 submarkets based on drug form either, correct? Correct, nor do I agree that's 22 Α. 23 appropriate. 24 And you didn't create 0. 25 submarkets based on the symptoms listed in the

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 140 of 297

Page 141 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 indication, correct? 3 Correct. I don't view that as Α. appropriate in light of the evidence I 4 5 reviewed. 6 You also did not consider in 0. 7 your analysis how long each of the products 8 were on the market before reaching their peak 9 sales, correct? 10 Α. I don't agree with that. 11 Well, let's turn to your Q. 12 Exhibit -- or Attachment B-5. 13 Α. Okay. 14 0. And this is a comparison to 15 PAH drug revenues showing sales for peak years 16 for each of the drugs; is that correct? 17 Α. Yes. 18 ο. And in this attachment you 19 don't specify when the drug was first launched, 20 correct? 21 Not in this attachment, but Α. 22 one can see it in Attachment B-4 on the 23 previous page. 24 But in your conclusions Q. 25 regarding peak sales, you don't provide any

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 141 of 297

	Page 142
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	analysis of what effect, if any, the year the
3	peak sales came about based on the year the
4	drug was launched, right?
5	A. I don't agree with that, and
6	in particular I would point you to paragraph 24
7	where I indicate what the impact of different
8	drugs being on the market for different lengths
9	of time has which is that we know Tyvaso has
10	already achieved peak sales because its sales
11	have already started declining from 2015 to
12	2016 and then from 2016 to 2017 based on the
13	most recent data reported by UTC. Whereas,
14	other drugs are continuing to increase. They
15	have not already hit peak sales.
16	So this comparison will look
17	even more favorable to the other drugs and less
18	favorable to Tyvaso into the future. So that's
19	the sense in which I am thinking about how long
20	the drugs have been on the market and whether
21	their sales will continue to increase.
22	Q. So if a drug had a
23	particularly good year and had extremely high
24	peak sales one year and low sales before and
25	after that, do you still think that peak annual

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 142 of 297

	Page 143
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	sales are a relevant factor to consider?
3	A. That's not a typical situation
4	that occurs in pharmaceuticals. Sales tend to
5	be more similar from year to year or increasing
6	or decreasing on a more regular basis. It's
7	not frequently the case that sales vary wildly
8	from one year to the next.
9	Q. Well, I am asking
10	hypothetically if a product has one really good
11	year for whatever reason and before and after
12	have low sales, doesn't that mean that peak
13	sales for that year are not really indicative
14	of commercial success?
15	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
16	BY THE WITNESS:
17	A. That's a theoretical situation
18	that could be true in some circumstances. It's
19	not true generally in pharmaceuticals, and it's
20	not true based on the evidence I have reviewed
21	here in this case. I have reviewed sales
22	across all years, and peak sales are the good
23	summary statistic for comparing across products
24	based on that analysis.
25	

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 143 of 297

Page 144 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 3 0. For your peak sale analysis, 4 did you -- strike that. Your declaration does not 5 6 disclose any analysis for peak sales of the 7 various drugs in relation to factors that may 8 affect that year's sales that are unique to the 9 drug, correct? 10 MR. MATHAS: Object to the form. 11 BY THE WITNESS: 12 Α. I am not sure what you have in 13 Could you explain? mind. 14 BY MR. DELAFIELD: 15 So, for example, if a brand Q. drug comes on the market and for some reason 16 17 the very next year a generic comes on the 18 market, their peak sales might be the first 19 year. 20 Is that a fair assessment? 21 Apologies. 22 Α. That doesn't tend to happen 23 but it could. 24 So external factors such as 0. 25 the launch of a generic can affect sales for

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 144 of 297

	Page 145
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	any given year, correct?
3	A. They can. Sales can decline
4	after generics come on the market. That's
5	frequently what happens.
6	Q. And, similarly, if a drug
7	comes on the market with the same indication
8	and is followed quickly by another drug with
9	the exact same indication, their peak sale year
10	may be different just based on the fact of the
11	timing of the competition, correct?
12	A. It could be. That's how
13	competition works.
14	Q. So peak annual sales could be
15	the result of external factors such as other
16	drugs coming on or off the market or other
17	drugs becoming genericized, correct?
18	A. Well, you described them as
19	external factors, but they are relevant
20	factors. They are relevant factors for
21	competition, and it's the set of factors the
22	set of competitive factors that determines how
23	well a products does. So it's relevant to the
24	analysis.
25	Q. But for commercial success,

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 145 of 297

	Page 146
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	there must be a nexus to the patented elements,
3	correct?
4	A. Generally, yes, there must be
5	a nexus.
6	Q. And so if sales are really
7	good or really bad based on factors that are
8	not related to the patent, then they would be
9	external factors, correct?
10	A. You don't frequently hear that
11	term, but I see what you are saying. That's
12	not the way it's typically described.
13	Q. If you could turn to paragraph
14	33 of your declaration.
15	A. I'm there.
16	Q. And the second sentence says:
17	"For example, Tyvaso's designation as an orphan
18	drug (reserved for products with low commercial
19	opportunity and/or fewer than 200,000 U.S.
20	patients) indicates limited economic
21	opportunity."
22	Do you see that?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. So you understand Tyvaso is an
25	orphan drug, right?

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 146 of 297

Page 147 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Α. Yes. 3 And there are fewer than 0. 200,000 U.S. patients, correct, according to 4 your definition here? 5 6 Well, orphan drug status can Α. 7 be granted based on a low commercial 8 opportunity or fewer than 200,000 patients. I 9 don't recall which prong was met for Tyvaso, 10 and I don't recall whether the current count of 11 PAH treatment is less than 200,000. I would 12 have to go back and check. 13 Do you know how many people in 0. 14 the U.S. approximately have pulmonary 15 hypertension? 16 I believe it's in the hundreds A 17 of thousands, but I would have to go back and 18 look to confirm. 19 So it could be fewer than Ο. 20 200,000, correct? 21 Α. It could be, and I believe it 22 was at one point in time. 23 Orphan drug status is specific 0. 24 to number of patients because the FDA requires 25 less to get their approval simply because

> David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 147 of 297

	Page 148
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	there's not enough people for clinical trials.
3	Have you heard that? Are you
4	familiar with that concept?
5	A. I don't believe that's the
6	primary economic rationale for granting orphan
7	drug status. I believe it has to do with
8	limited commercial opportunity and wanting to
9	provide incentives for development where there
10	otherwise would not be.
11	Q. But to your knowledge, the FDA
12	designates whether or not a drug is an orphan
13	drug, correct?
14	A. Yes, I believe so.
15	Q. And the FDA doesn't care about
16	commercial opportunity. Just whether or not
17	there's enough patients to qualify for the
18	required clinical testing, right?
19	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
20	BY THE WITNESS:
21	A. That may be one factor that
22	they consider. Again, there are two prongs
23	under which a drug can qualify for orphan drug
24	status: The number of patients and also a lack
25	of commercial opportunity.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 148 of 297

	Page 149
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
3	Q. But it's your opinion that at
4	most patients with pulmonary hypertension are
5	in the hundreds of thousands, correct?
6	A. As I indicated earlier, that's
7	my best recollection, but to be sure, I would
8	have to go back and confirm. I don't recall
9	the specific figure sitting here.
10	Q. There's approximately 325
11	million people in the U.S.
12	Do you agree with that?
13	A. More or less.
14	Q. So even if the full 200,000
15	patients had pulmonary hypertension, that would
16	be far less than 1 percent of the U.S.
17	population, correct?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Now, if you turn to paragraph
20	23, you say: "First, Tyvaso's annual sales
21	ranging from \$152 million to \$470 million are
22	not exceptional or even above average in the
23	context of pharmaceutical product sales."
24	Do you see that?
25	A. Yes.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 149 of 297

Page 150 1 DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D. 2 Q. And then you go on to analyze 3 the first -- strike that. 4 You go on to analyze the top 5 two decile percentages for drugs, correct? 6 Α. As well as the averages, yes. 7 Now, do you know how many 0. 8 drugs are in the top decile in terms of sales 9 that are orphan drugs? 10 Α. I don't know the number. I do 11 know that orphan drugs can and do have sales at 12 that magnitude. 13 0. Other than pulmonary 14 hypertension, can you think of any other 15 indication that's an orphan -- orphan --16 treated with orphan drugs that is in the top 17 decile? 18 Α. There's a number of cancer 19 drugs that are orphan drugs that have sales in 20 the billions. There's various cancer 21 indications that qualify. 22 Q. Do you know if the majority of 23 the drugs in the top two deciles are prescribed 24 for -- strike that. 25 Would you agree that the drugs

David Feldman Worldwide A Veritext Company

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 150 of 297

	Page 151
1	DEFOREST MCDUFF, Ph.D.
2	in the top two deciles of sales are typically
3	blockbuster drugs that have millions of
4	patients?
5	MR. MATHAS: Object to the form.
6	BY THE WITNESS:
7	A. I don't know that that's
8	generally true.
9	BY MR. DELAFIELD:
10	Q. Well, isn't it relevant to
11	know how many patients there are before you
12	compare to the largest sales across all drugs?
13	A. One could look at that
14	information, but it's not needed for my
15	analysis here of putting Tyvaso sales into
16	context relative to the industry.
17	Q. But you are putting orphan
18	drug sales in the context of all drug sales,
19	correct?
20	A. I wouldn't describe it that
21	way. I agree with you that Tyvaso is an orphan
22	drug, and in paragraph 23 I compare it to the
23	range of sales in the industry, and then in
24	paragraph 24 I compare it to other PAH drugs
25	specifically.

800-642-1099

www.veritext.com

UNITED THERAPEUTICS, EX. 2035 WATSON LABORATORIES v. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01621 Page 151 of 297