

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	XI
DEFINITIONS.....	XIII
INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC.....	1
Scope of the dissertation	5
Research methodology	7
Dissertation outline	9
PART I: COMPARING THE US-PTE AND EU-SPC SYSTEMS – SIMILAR BUT NOT EQUAL?	11
Chapter A: Legislative framework and rationale of the US-PTE and EU-SPC Systems.....	13
1. Legislative framework.....	13
1.1. Introduction of PTEs in the US.....	15
1.1.1. Historical development.....	15
1.1.2. Distribution of rights and benefits	23
1.2. Introduction of SPCs in the EU	25
1.2.1. Historical development.....	26
1.2.2. Distribution of rights and benefits	32
1.3. Comparative analysis: rights and benefits under the systems	33
2. Rationale	34
2.1. Rationale of the US-PTE System.....	35
2.1.1. Promotion of innovation	35
2.1.2. Balance of interests.....	37
2.2. Rationale of the EU-SPC System	39
2.2.1. Explanatory Memorandum to the SPC Regulation	39
2.2.1.1. Promotion of innovation.....	40
2.2.1.2. Balance of interests.....	41
2.2.1.3. Harmonisation, simplicity and transparency	42
2.2.2. Case law of the CJEU	43

2.2.2.1. Promotion of innovation.....	43
2.2.2.2. Balance of interests.....	44
2.2.2.3. Harmonisation	46
2.3. Comparative analysis: rationale of the systems	47
3. Conclusion	50
Chapter B: Institutional framework and requirements for the grant of SPCs and PTEs	53
1. Institutional setting and procedure.....	53
1.1. Marketing authorisation/approval: granting authority and procedure ...	53
1.1.1. The EU: European Medicines Agency	54
1.1.2. The US: Food and Drug Administration	56
1.2. SPC/PTE: granting authority and procedure	57
1.2.1. The EU: national patent offices of the Member States.....	57
1.2.2. The US: United States Patent and Trademark Office.....	60
1.3. Comparative analysis: institutional setting and procedure	61
2. Granting requirements.....	62
2.1. Granting requirements under the SPC Regulation.....	62
2.1.1. Definition of “product”	63
2.1.2. Substantive requirements for the SPC grant.....	72
2.1.2.1. The product is protected by a patent in force	72
2.1.2.2. The product is covered by a valid MA	74
2.1.2.3. The product is not the subject of a previous SPC	76
2.1.2.4. The MA is the first granted for the product in the Member State	78
2.2. Granting requirements under the USC.....	79
2.2.1. Definition of “drug product”	79
2.2.2. Substantive requirements for the PTE grant.....	81
2.2.2.1. The product is protected by a patent in force	82
2.2.2.2. The patent term has not been extended before	84
2.2.2.3. The PTE applicant is the patent owner or his agent.....	85
2.2.2.4. First permitted commercial marketing or use in the US	86

2.3. Comparative analysis: SPC/PTE grant requirements and related case law	86
3. Conclusion and outlook.....	90
PART II: CAN THE EU-SPC SYSTEM LEARN FROM THE US-PTE SYSTEM?	93
Chapter A: Opening the EU-SPC System to follow-on drugs	95
1. Patentability of follow-on drugs	96
1.1. Europe	96
1.1.1. Derivatives	99
1.1.2. New therapeutic uses	100
1.1.3. New formulations and dosage regimes	101
1.2. The US	103
1.2.1. Derivatives	106
1.2.2. New therapeutic uses	108
1.2.3. New formulations and dosage regimes	109
1.3. Discussion: patentability of follow-on drugs in Europe and the US ...	111
2. Prolongation of patent protection for follow-on drugs	113
2.1. SPCs for follow-on drugs.....	113
2.1.1. Derivatives	114
2.1.2. New therapeutic uses, formulations and dosage regimes	116
2.1.2.1. Landmark decision: Neurim	116
2.1.2.2. Pre-Neurim: Pharmacia, Yissum and MIT	119
2.1.2.3. Post-Neurim: Abraxis and Santen	124
2.1.2.4. Analysis	129
2.2. PTEs for follow-on drugs.....	133
2.2.1. Derivatives	134
2.2.2. New therapeutic uses, formulations and dosage regimes	141
2.3. Discussion: justification of SPCs for follow-on drugs?	142
3. Proposed amendments to the SPC Regulation.....	151

**Chapter B: Implementing the notions of due diligence and agency in
the EU-SPC System 153**

1. Due diligence..... 155

1.1. The US 155

1.1.1. Method of calculation of the PTE term 155

1.1.2. Redetermination of the regulatory review period..... 158

1.1.3. Due diligence petitions before the FDA 158

1.1.3.1. Calculation of the regulatory review period..... 161

1.1.3.2. The FDA: a merely administrative role..... 170

1.2. The EU 175

1.2.1. Method of calculation of the SPC term 175

1.2.2. Lack of a control mechanism..... 177

1.2.3. Concept of due care in European law 178

1.2.3.1. Administrative procedure before the EPO 179

1.2.3.2. Administrative procedure before the EUIPO 180

1.3. Discussion: implementation of due diligence in the
EU-SPC System? 181

2. Agency..... 186

2.1. The US 187

2.2. The EU 193

2.3. Discussion: implementation of agency in the EU-SPC System?..... 196

3. Proposed amendments to the SPC Regulation..... 200

FINAL CONCLUSION 205

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES.....XIX

STATUTES AND OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.....XXI

CASE LAW..... XXVII

BIBLIOGRAPHYXXXIII