| Lis | st of Abbreviations | 15 | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|--|--|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | | | | |
| Α. | . Overview | | | | |
| В. | Outline of the dissertation | 25 | | | |
| C. | Scope of the dissertation | 25 | | | |
| II. | PHARMACEUTICAL INVENTIONS, INNOVATIONS & | | | | |
| | PRODUCTS | 28 | | | |
| Α. | Cumulative nature of inventions | | | | |
| | 1. Basic and second generation inventions | 29 | | | |
| | a) Improvement inventions | 30 | | | |
| | b) Selection inventions | 30 | | | |
| В. | Inventions and innovations in pharmaceutical field | | | | |
| | 1. Inventions and patents in pharmaceutical field | 32 | | | |
| | a) Product invention and the absolute character of its | | | | |
| | protection | 33 | | | |
| | b) Hierarchy of pharmaceutical patents | 34 | | | |
| | 2. Innovations in pharmaceutical field | 36 | | | |
| | a) Invention v. innovation | 36 | | | |
| | b) NMEs as the core of pharmaceutical innovation | 37 | | | |
| C. | Second generation inventions and patents in pharmaceuticals | | | | |
| | 1. Product inventions and patents | | | | |
| | a) Species selection inventions | 39 | | | |
| | b) Optical isomers | 43 | | | |
| | c) Crystalline forms | 46 | | | |
| | d) Metabolites and prodrugs | 47 | | | |
| | e) Esters and salts | 49 | | | |
| | f) Dosage forms | 49 | | | |
| | g) Combinations of active ingredients | 50 | | | |



| | 2. | Use inventions | 50 | | |
|-----|---|--|----------|--|--|
| | | a) New Use/New method of treatment | 50 | | |
| | | b) Dosage regime | 52 | | |
| | 3. | Process inventions | 52 | | |
| | | a) Process | 52 | | |
| | | b) Intermediates | 53 | | |
| D. | Pharmaceutical products in the market | | | | |
| | 1. | New medical entities, new molecular entities | 54 | | |
| | 2. | Similar or equivalent "me-too" products | 54 | | |
| | 3. | Second generation products | 56 | | |
| | 4. | Generic drugs | 57 | | |
| E. | Su | mmary | 58 | | |
| III | S | PECIFICITIES IN PHARMACEUTICALS AND RECENT | | | |
| | | DEVELOPMENTS | 59 | | |
| Α. | Innovating and inventing in pharmaceutical industry | | | | |
| | 1. | Specificities in the drug development process | 59 | | |
| | | a) Highly regulated industry | 59 | | |
| | | b) R&D – a costly and lengthy road to a medicine | 60 | | |
| | | c) Uncertainties in post-invention development | 64 | | |
| | | (1) Scientific uncertainty: Unpredictability of substances | 64 | | |
| | | (2) Regulatory and market uncertainties | 65 | | |
| | | d) Information rich chemicals | 66 | | |
| | 2. | Specificities in the market for pharmaceuticals | 67 | | |
| | | a) Imitation with negligible cost and much reduced risk | 67 | | |
| | | b) Prescription based purchase: A disconnection between | | | |
| | | choosers and payers | 68 | | |
| | | c) Information asymmetry and high loyalty to a medicine | 69 | | |
| | _ | d) Pricing | 70 | | |
| | 3. | Specificities of the patent protection for pharmaceuticals | 72 | | |
| | | a) Patent protection for industrial technologies | 72 | | |
| | | b) Patent protection in the pharmaceutical industry | 74 76 | | |
| | Challenges and overcoming efforts | | | | |
| | | Decreased R&D productivity | 78 | | |
| | 2. | Dearth of new medical entities | 80 | | |
| | | a) Significance of NMEs | 80 | | |
| | | b) Decreased number of NMEs | 80 | | |

| | | c) Potential reasons for the decrease | 83 | | | |
|-----|--|--|-----|--|--|--|
| | | (1) Decrease in solvable scientific problems | 83 | | | |
| | | (2) Stringent safety regulations | 84 | | | |
| | | (3) Problem of over-disclosure | 84 | | | |
| | | (4) Early and numerous abandonments of potential | | | | |
| | | candidates | 85 | | | |
| | 3. | Patent cliffs of blockbuster medications | 86 | | | |
| | 4. | Frequent merger and acquisitions (M&As) and in-licensing | 86 | | | |
| | 5. | Drastic increase of second generation inventions | 88 | | | |
| | | a) Life cycle management or evergreening | 89 | | | |
| | | b) Drastic increase of this activity supported by the number | | | | |
| | | of second generation patents | 91 | | | |
| C | Sin | mmary | 93 | | | |
| О. | - Cu. | | ,,, | | | |
| IV. | S' | TANDARDS OF PATENTABILITY FOR | | | | |
| | | HARMACEUTICAL SELECTION INVENTIONS | 95 | | | |
| A. | Novelty and anticipation | | | | | |
| | 1. Introduction | | | | | |
| | Introduction Examination of novelty | | | | | |
| | | Inherent anticipation and enablement | 103 | | | |
| | | Novelty of selection inventions | 106 | | | |
| | | a) Species selection inventions | 106 | | | |
| | | b) Optical isomers | 117 | | | |
| | | c) Crystalline forms | 127 | | | |
| | | d) Metabolite | 130 | | | |
| | 5. | Analysis and conclusion | 133 | | | |
| B. | Inventive step / Non-obviousness | | | | | |
| | 1. Inventive step in patentability requirements | | | | | |
| | | Examination of inventive step | 136 | | | |
| | 3. | Inventive step requirement for selection inventions | 144 | | | |
| | | a) Species selection invention | 144 | | | |
| | | b) Optical isomers | 150 | | | |
| | | c) Crystalline forms | 157 | | | |
| | | d) Metabolites | 164 | | | |
| | 4. | Analysis and conclusion | 164 | | | |
| C. | Disclosure requirement 16 | | | | | |
| | 1. Written description requirement | | | | | |

| | 2. | Enablement requirement | | | |
|----|---|------------------------|--|-----|--|
| | | a) | Enablement requirement | 171 | |
| | | b) | Enablement requirements in the patent law | 175 | |
| | | | (1) Enablement as a requirement for anticipation | 175 | |
| | | | (2) Basic similarity of the two enablement requirements | 176 | |
| | | | (3) Differences between the two enablement requirements | 177 | |
| | 3. | Dis | sclosure requirement of selection inventions | 178 | |
| | | a) | Species selection invention | 178 | |
| | | b) | Optical isomers | 179 | |
| | | c) | Crystalline forms | 180 | |
| D. | Co | ncl | usion | 180 | |
| V. | II | MPI | LICATIONS OF THE PATENTABILITY | | |
| | R | ΕQ | UIREMENTS ON INNOVATION AND COMPETITION | | |
| | Π | N T | HE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY | 184 | |
| A. | Concerns about lowered patentability | | | | |
| | 1. | Ge | neral concerns about lowered patentability | 185 | |
| | | a) | Superfluous second generation patents | 185 | |
| | | b) | Increased patent exclusivities and amplified uncertainties | | |
| | | | thereof | 187 | |
| | | c) | Encouraged waste of resources | 190 | |
| | | d) | Hindrance of pharmaceutical innovation | 192 | |
| | 2. Concerns about the novelty requirements | | oncerns about the novelty requirements | 194 | |
| | | a) | Language dependent prior art disclosure problem | 194 | |
| | | | Rendering inventive step requirement meaningless | 196 | |
| | | c) | Potential concerns of "direct and unambiguous" disclosure | | |
| | | | requirement | 198 | |
| B. | Implications considering the breadth of selection patents | | | | |
| | 1. Scope of the protection | | | | |
| | 2. | Sc | cope of selection patents | 203 | |
| | | a) | Species selection patents | 203 | |
| | | | Optical isomers | 203 | |
| | | | Metabolite | 206 | |
| | | - | Polymorphs | 208 | |
| | 3. | A: | nalysis and conclusion | 209 | |

| C. | Implications considering the length of selection patents | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----|--|--|
| | 1. | Patent term and patent term extension | 211 | | |
| | | a) In Europe | 212 | | |
| | | b) In the United States | 213 | | |
| | | c) In Korea | 214 | | |
| | 2. | Patent term extension on selection patents | | | |
| | | a) Species selection patents | 215 | | |
| | | b) Optical isomers | 215 | | |
| | | c) Polymorphs | 218 | | |
| | | d) Metabolite | 218 | | |
| | 3. | Analysis and conclusion | 218 | | |
| D. | Im | plications on the competition in the pharmaceutical industry | 222 | | |
| | 1. | Introduction | 222 | | |
| | 2. | Quasi-obstacles of generics market entry | 225 | | |
| | | a) Scope of second generation patents | 225 | | |
| | | b) Length of second generation patents | 227 | | |
| | | c) Delayed filing of second generation patent applications | 227 | | |
| | 3. Real obstacles to generics' market entry | | 229 | | |
| | | a) Automatic thirty-month stay and new list up in the Orange | | | |
| | | Book in the United States | 229 | | |
| | | b) Pendency of patent applications: Uncertainty | 231 | | |
| | | (1) Pendency of patent applications | 231 | | |
| | | (2) Filing of divisional applications | 232 | | |
| | | c) Active movement of the market to new products | 237 | | |
| | | d) Along with very specific patents on the secondary products | 240 | | |
| | 4. | Analysis and conclusion | 242 | | |
| E. | Su | mmary and conclusion | 243 | | |
| VI | . Р | PROPOSALS | 245 | | |
| Α. | Int | roduction | 247 | | |
| В. | Nature of selection inventions | | | | |
| | 1. | Different natures of selection inventions | 249 | | |
| | | a) Species selection invention | 249 | | |
| | | b) Other selection inventions | 251 | | |
| | 2. | Selection inventions from the era of penicillin to the 21th | | | |
| | | century | 251 | | |
| | | a) Early medications and the novelty requirement | 251 | | |

| | | b) "Made available to the public" for the first time | 252 | | |
|----|---|---|-----|--|--|
| | 3. | Analysis and conclusion | 254 | | |
| C. | Proposals on the breadth of patents | | | | |
| | 1. | Arguments on the breadth of patents | 255 | | |
| | | a) Arguments for a broader patent scope | 256 | | |
| | | b) Arguments against a broader patent scope | 258 | | |
| | | c) Arguments on patent scope with consideration of other | | | |
| | | relevant factors | 260 | | |
| | 2. | Interim conclusion | 261 | | |
| | 3. | Solutions to the overlapping scope with species selection | | | |
| | | invention | 264 | | |
| | | a) Voluntary licensing agreements | 265 | | |
| | | b) Non-voluntary licenses | 266 | | |
| | | (1) Compulsory licenses | 267 | | |
| | | (2) Case law relevant to compulsory licenses | 269 | | |
| | | c) Reverse doctrine of equivalents | 272 | | |
| | | d) Conclusion | 274 | | |
| D. | Proposals on the length of patents 2 | | | | |
| | 1. | Arguments on the length of patents | 275 | | |
| | 2. | Proposals on the length of patents | 277 | | |
| | | a) Proposal on the length of basic patents | 277 | | |
| | | (1) Introduction | 277 | | |
| | | (2) Proposed term of basic patents | 278 | | |
| | | (3) The basis of the proposal | 279 | | |
| | | (4) Expected effects | 281 | | |
| | | b) Proposal on the patent term extension of second generation | | | |
| | | patents | 282 | | |
| E. | Proposals on the patentability requirements | | | | |
| | 1. | Introduction: Technology specific patentability standards | 283 | | |
| | 2. | Proposals on the novelty requirement | 286 | | |
| | | a) Arguments on the novelty requirement | 286 | | |
| | | b) Proposal on the novelty requirement of species selection | | | |
| | | invention | 287 | | |
| | | (1) Meaning of something "made available to the public" | | | |
| | | in the pharmaceutical industry | 287 | | |
| | | (2) A patent as a double-edged sword to NMEs | 289 | | |

| | | (3) Statutory exceptions to the novelty requirement and | |
|---------|------|--|---------|
| | | considerations thereof | 290 |
| | | (4) Proposed novelty requirement for NMEs | 291 |
| | | (5) Appreciation of the Olanzapine decision and its | |
| | | expected results | 293 |
| | c) | Discussion on the novelty requirement of other selection | |
| | , | inventions | 294 |
| 3. | Pro | oposals on the inventive step requirement | 294 |
| | | Arguments on the inventive step requirement | 295 |
| | • | (1) Arguments for a strict inventive step requirement | 295 |
| | | (2) Arguments for a strict inventive step requirement | |
| | | together with broader protection | 296 |
| | | (3) Arguments against a strict inventive step requirement | 297 |
| | | (4) Arguments for the relaxed inventive step requirement | |
| | | in risky and expensive R&D fields | 297 |
| | b) | Proposal on the inventive step of species selection | |
| | ĺ | inventions | 299 |
| | c) | Proposal on the inventive step of other selection inventions | 300 |
| | • | (1) Introduction | 300 |
| | | (2) Proposed standard to assess the inventive step | 301 |
| | | (3) Basis of the proposal | 301 |
| | | (4) Expected effects | 304 |
| 4. | Di | scussions on the sufficiency requirement | 306 |
| | a) | Discrepancy between the scope of and the disclosure of a | |
| | | genus claim | 306 |
| | b) | Stringent disclosure requirement of the basic invention | 307 |
| | c) | Conclusion | 309 |
| F. Co | ncl | usion | 309 |
| | | | • • • • |
| VII. F | IN/ | AL CONCLUSIONS | 312 |
| | | | |
| List of | Sta | atutory Instruments | 321 |
| | | _ | |
| List of | Ca | se Laws | 323 |
| Biblio | grai | ohv | 333 |
| | | | |