

THE SCIENCE THAT CHANGED THE WORLD

*Volume One — Medicine & the Body: Sixteen Medical
Breakthroughs Now in the Public Domain*

By

MARTIN CARR

INDEPENDENT PUBLISHER

Copyright © 2026 by Martin Carr.

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, digitalized, or transmitted in any form without written permission from the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews.

Publisher: Independent Publisher

ISBN Placeholder

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction — The Fence That Comes Down	4
Part One — The Robot Enters the Operating Theatre	8
The Surgeon's Robot Hands	9
The Robot That Held the Camera	18
The Keyhole Revolution	23
Part Two — Reading and Seeing the Body	28
The Gene Chip	29
Sequencing by Light	34
Making Disease Glow	38
Part Three — Engineering the Antibody	42
Making Antibodies Human	43
Tuning the Antibody's Aim	48
The Next-Generation Fc	52
Part Four — The Body, Continuously Monitored	56
The Sensor That Never Sleeps	57
The Sensor That Calibrates Itself	61
The Smart Insulin Pump	65
Part Five — Repairing and Rebuilding	69
Energy That Seals Flesh	70
Rejoining the Vessels	74
A Refillable Implant for the Brain	78
Scaffolds for New Tissue	82
A Note on the Method	86

INTRODUCTION — THE FENCE THAT COMES DOWN

Behind every ordinary miracle of modern medicine there is a document almost nobody reads.

It is dry, defensive, and written in a language built to survive lawyers rather than to be understood. It talks about "a first jaw member" and "an elongate shaft" where you or I would say the robot's hand. It numbers its sentences. It repeats itself on purpose. It is a patent — and it is the closest thing we have to the birth certificate of an invention.

A patent is a bargain struck with time. In exchange for telling the world exactly how your invention works — publishing it, in full, for anyone to read — the state grants you twenty years to be the only one allowed to make it. Twenty years to earn back the risk, the failures, the decade in the lab, the fortune spent proving that the

thing works at all. And then, on a specific and unremarkable morning, the clock runs out and the second half of the bargain quietly completes itself: the monopoly ends, the fence comes down, and the invention becomes the property of everyone, forever.

This book is about that morning.

Each of the sixteen chapters tells the story of one medical breakthrough whose patent has now expired — the surgeon's robot hands, the sensor that reads your blood sugar without a needle, the antibody engineered to be accepted by a human host, the nanoparticle that makes a tumour glow. In every case the twenty years are up. The secret has been given away. What one company guarded and licensed and fought over in the courts is now common ground, free for anyone to build upon, improve, or simply make more cheaply.

I did not choose these sixteen by taste. They were chosen by the data.

Every patent records which later inventions cite it — the way a scientific paper lists the work it stands on. That citation count is a rough but honest measure of how heavily the world leaned on an idea: how many engineers, in the years that followed, had to reckon with it, design around it, or build upon it. I took a database of expired medical patents, ranked them by that number, stripped out the near-duplicate thickets so that each chapter is a distinct

breakthrough rather than one company's stack of paperwork, and kept the ones that had both a high impact and a human story worth telling. The citation counts you will see at the head of each chapter are real. So are the patent numbers, the companies, the grant years, and the expiry dates. You can look every one of them up.

A word on what this book is and is not. It is not a technical manual, and nothing in it is medical advice. The explanations are written for a curious general reader, not a specialist, and where I have had to choose between precision and clarity I have usually chosen clarity. For any serious purpose, the patents themselves — all freely readable now — are the primary source, and I would rather you go and read one than take my word for it.

What the book is, is an invitation to change where you stand.

We spend our lives on the near side of these inventions, using them without a thought — the keyhole scar that healed in a week, the sensor on a child's arm that means a parent can finally sleep, the drug that turned a death sentence into a manageable condition. This is a chance to walk, just once, around to the far side. To see how each was made, and by whom, and at what cost. To watch the pioneers who got there first and, as often as not, lost everything to whoever came second. And to notice the quiet moment — the one nobody announces — when an invention that changed the world is handed, at last, to us.

Nobody rings a bell on the day a patent expires. The fence just comes down, and almost no one looks up.

Let us look up.

PART ONE — THE ROBOT ENTERS THE OPERATING THEATRE

. . . .

CHAPTER 1

THE SURGEON'S ROBOT HANDS

Anchor patent: US 6,783,524 — "Robotic surgical tool with ultrasound cauterizing and cutting instrument." Intuitive Surgical, Inc., filed 2002, granted 2004. Cited by 3,775 later inventions. Entered the public domain in April 2022.

There is a photograph that unsettles people the first time they see it. A patient lies on an operating table, draped and asleep, four slim metal arms folded over the abdomen like the legs of an attentive insect. And the surgeon is nowhere near them. She sits several feet away with her head bowed into a viewer, her fingers moving inside a pair of controls, operating on a person she is not touching and, in a strict sense, cannot even reach. To anyone raised on the image of a surgeon leaning over a body, scalpel in a gloved hand, it looks less like medicine than like a video game with terrible stakes.

It is, in fact, one of the most consequential machines of the last half-century. And the part of it that mattered most — the part that was copied, cited, and fought over more than three and a half thousand times — was not the arms, or the viewer, or the software. It was the hands.

A PROBLEM OLDER THAN SURGERY

Keyhole surgery was supposed to be a gift to patients, and in most ways it was. Instead of laying a body open with a long incision, a surgeon could work through a few small ports — half-inch openings — sliding long instruments and a camera into the abdomen and operating by the picture on a screen. Patients bled less, hurt less, healed faster, went home sooner. A gallbladder removal that once meant a week in hospital and a scar the length of a hand became, by the 1990s, an overnight stay and a few marks that faded.

Laparoscopy was one of the great quiet revolutions of modern surgery.

But it asked something almost cruel of the surgeon. The instruments were long rigid sticks passed through a fixed point in the body wall, and that fixed point behaved like the pivot of a see-saw: it turned every movement backwards and upside down. Push your hand to the left, and the tip inside the patient swings to the right. Lift the handle, and the tip dips. The stick had no wrist, so its working end could not turn to face its target the way a human hand naturally does — it

could only point wherever the angle of entry happened to allow. And because the instrument was a long lever, the surgeon's own small, involuntary tremor, unnoticeable in ordinary life, was magnified at the far end into a visible shake.

So surgeons learned to work against their own instincts, for hours at a stretch, in postures that wrecked their necks and shoulders, translating every intention through a reversing fulcrum with a shaking tip. The best of them became astonishingly good at it. But it was a skill fighting the tool, not flowing through it. The keyhole had freed the patient and shackled the surgeon.

The obvious fix was to give the instrument back the thing evolution had spent millions of years perfecting: a wrist.

THE BATTLEFIELD THAT NEVER CAME

The idea that solved it did not begin in a hospital. It began, as an unnerving amount of modern technology does, with the military imagining a war.

In the late 1980s, researchers at SRI International in California — with funding from the American defence research agency, DARPA — were chasing a strange and specific dream they called telepresence surgery. The vision was a wounded soldier lying in a field, and a surgeon safe at a base miles away, operating on him

remotely through a robotic system: the surgeon's hand movements captured at a console, carried down a wire, and reproduced by instruments at the front. Blood would not have to wait for evacuation; the surgeon could reach the soldier without being in the line of fire.

Battlefield surgery-by-robot never really happened; the logistics and the risks were formidable, and the wars it was imagined for did not unfold that way. But to build even a working prototype, the SRI team had to solve a genuinely beautiful sub-problem. How do you make a machine reproduce the fine, intuitive movements of a human hand deep inside a body — faithfully, in real time, with the tremor filtered out and the scale shrunk down so that a broad, comfortable gesture becomes a movement of a millimetre? Solve that, and you have solved something far larger than battlefield medicine.

A young physician-entrepreneur named Frederick Moll saw the prototype and understood that its real destiny was not the battlefield but the ordinary operating theatre. The thing that could let a surgeon operate on a distant soldier could, much more usefully, let a surgeon operate on the patient right in front of her without fighting the reversing, wristless stick. In 1995 he and his co-founders licensed the SRI work and started a company with a name that reached back to the first great anatomist-engineer, the man who drew both the machinery of the body and the machines of his imagination: Intuitive Surgical. Their system would be christened da Vinci.

What they built inverted the entire relationship between surgeon and patient. The surgeon no longer stood at the table; she sat at a console a few feet away, looking into a viewer that gave her a true three-dimensional image of the operative field, magnified and rock-steady — a better view than she could ever have had leaning over the body. Her fingers went into controls that sensed every motion she made. And between her hands and the instruments, the system did three quiet, transformative things. It scaled the movement down, so that a natural, unhurried gesture translated into a tiny, precise motion inside the patient. It filtered out the tremor entirely, giving even a steady-handed surgeon a steadiness no human possesses. And it corrected the geometry, so that the reversing, upside-down nightmare of the laparoscopic fulcrum simply vanished — the instrument moved the way her hand moved, right way up and correct. The machine did the awkward translation so that the human no longer had to.

THE HANDS

Intuitive called the instruments EndoWrist, and the name was the whole point. Where the old laparoscopic stick ended in a rigid jaw, these ended in a tiny, cable-driven wrist that could pitch, yaw, grip, and rotate — inside a space no wider than a fingertip. The surgeon's hand turned; the little wrist, deep in the pelvis or the chest, turned with it. For the first time, a surgeon working through a keyhole could face her needle in any direction and sew as naturally as if her own

miniature hand were inside the patient. The single most difficult thing to do through a laparoscopic port — to suture, cleanly and at any angle — became something a mortal could learn in a reasonable time.

Patent US 6,783,524 is one instrument in that family, and a telling one to choose, because it shows how much thought goes into a single tip. Its official title is a mouthful: "Robotic surgical tool with ultrasound cauterizing and cutting instrument." In plain terms, it is a robot hand that does three jobs in one pass. It grips tissue. It cuts with ultrasound — a blade vibrating tens of thousands of times a second, so fast that it slices while barely bruising what it passes and generates heat that seals as it goes. And it cauterizes, closing the tiny vessels along the cut so the wound does not bleed. Grip, cut, and seal, in a single wristed tool the machine drives with the surgeon's intent.

Read the patent itself and you will find no grand language about revolutionising medicine. Patents never do; grandeur is not their job. It is dry and defensive, all "a first jaw member pivotally coupled to..." and "means for transmitting ultrasonic energy to..." That flatness is deceptive. This is the document that stakes out the ground where the robot meets the living flesh — and the field noticed. Over the two decades that followed, 3,775 later patents cited it: rivals trying to design around it, successors building on it, patent examiners citing it as the state of the art that everything after it had

to get past. In the database this book is drawn from, that citation count sits among the very highest in all of medicine. By the numbers, it is one of the hands that reached furthest.

WHAT IT CHANGED

The killer application arrived where few would have guessed: the prostate. Removing a cancerous prostate gland is a notoriously delicate operation. The gland sits deep in the pelvis, in a narrow, unforgiving space, wrapped in the fine nerves that govern continence and sexual function — nerves a surgeon must spare if the patient is to leave the operation whole in more than one sense. It is exactly the kind of deep, cramped, precise work at which a rigid laparoscopic stick fails and a human wrist can barely reach. It was almost as if the disease had been waiting for a wristed instrument on a steady, tremor-free arm. Robot-assisted prostatectomy spread across the hospitals of the world with startling speed, and it pulled the rest of surgery along in its wake — gynaecology, kidney surgery, cardiac work, operations on the head and neck through the mouth.

It changed more than technique. It changed the economics of hospitals, which now bought million-dollar machines and advertised them on billboards to attract patients. It changed how surgeons were trained, bolting a flight-simulator layer onto an apprenticeship that had been, in its essentials, unchanged since the nineteenth century. It changed the map of an industry, minting one of the most valuable

medical-device companies on earth — a company built on a wall of patents with this one near its foundation. And it changed, above all, what patients could expect: that even a major operation deep inside the body might leave nothing but a few small marks and a recovery measured in days.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

For US 6,783,524, the morning arrived in April 2022. The wristed, cutting, sealing robot hand that helped build an empire is now, in the eyes of the law, a public recipe. Anyone may make it. Anyone may improve on it. The specific edge that a single company held for twenty years has quietly become common ground — part of the shared inheritance that every future surgical robot gets to start from for free.

This is not a loophole or a failure of the system. It is the system working exactly as designed. The patent is a temporary fence built specifically so that it can one day be taken down. The knowledge was always going to end up here, in the commons; the twenty-year monopoly was simply the price society agreed to pay to get the thing invented in the first place, and to get it published in full rather than kept as a trade secret. The bargain has two halves, and this is the half we tend to forget.

What is striking is how invisible the moment is. No headline marked

the day the surgeon's robot hands became everyone's. The share price did not move. The fence came down and almost no one looked up. The prostate patient still goes home the next morning, sore for a week rather than laid up for a month, and he rarely knows that a robot did the delicate part — and never that the robot's hands are, as of a Tuesday in the spring of 2022, in the public domain. But they are. They belong to him now, and to you, and to whoever builds the next one.

CHAPTER 2

THE ROBOT THAT HELD THE CAMERA

Anchor patent: US 5,878,193 — "Automated endoscope system for optimal positioning." Computer Motion, Inc., granted 1999. Cited by 2,592 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2016.

Before da Vinci, there was a robot whose entire job was to hold still.

In laparoscopic surgery the surgeon operates by looking at a screen, and the picture on that screen comes from an endoscope — a slim rod carrying a camera and a light, poked in through one of the ports. Someone has to hold that endoscope. For years that someone was a human assistant, very often the most junior person in the room: a resident or a nurse, standing at the table with an arm outstretched, holding the camera exactly where the surgeon wanted it, for the length of the whole operation. It sounds trivial until you try it. An outstretched arm tires within minutes. A tired arm drifts, and shakes,

and — at the worst possible moment, just as the surgeon reaches the delicate part — wanders off the target or lets the view roll slightly askew. The most important image in the operating theatre was in the hands of the person with the least experience and the most tired arm.

THE FIRST SURGICAL ROBOT

Computer Motion, a Californian company founded by the engineer Yulun Wang, decided a machine could do this humble job far better than a person. Their device was called AESOP — the Automated Endoscopic System for Optimal Positioning — and it was, in essence, a robotic arm that held the camera and moved it precisely on command. The surgeon could steer the view with a foot pedal, and then, in a version that felt like science fiction at the time, simply by speaking: AESOP, move left. AESOP, in. AESOP, stop. The camera would go exactly where it was told and stay there, motionless and untiring, for as long as the operation lasted — no drift, no shake, no fatigue, no wandering attention.

It is easy to overlook AESOP now, dwarfed in memory by the surgeon-at-a-console spectacle of the machines that followed. But it holds a genuine and important first: it was the earliest robot cleared by the American regulator for use in surgery. Before the headlines about robotic operations, before da Vinci's four arms, a robot was already quietly at work in operating theatres doing an essential thing that no human could do quite well enough — holding a camera

perfectly steady for hours.

Computer Motion did not stop there. From the camera-holder AESOP they built ZEUS, a full robotic surgical system with arms the surgeon controlled from a console — a direct rival to the machine that Frederick Moll's Intuitive Surgical was building a few hours up the same coast. For a few remarkable years at the turn of the millennium there were two American companies, not one, racing to put robots into surgery, each convinced it would define the field.

THE PATENT THIS CHAPTER IS BUILT ON

US 5,878,193 covers the heart of AESOP's contribution: a system that positions an endoscope automatically and optimally, moving the camera to keep the surgeon's view where it should be without a human hand on the shaft. Like every patent, it reads as a careful list of dry claims — a manipulator arm, a controller, a means of directing the scope in response to the surgeon's commands. But beneath the dry language it stakes out something genuinely new: the idea that the machine, not the assistant, should be responsible for the surgeon's view of the operation.

That idea turned out to be foundational. More than 2,500 later inventions cite this patent — a measure of how many people who came afterwards had to build on, or design around, the notion of a robot managing the surgical camera. Almost every surgical robot

since has had to solve the same problem of where the eyes go and who moves them, and this is where the solving began.

HOW THE PIONEER LOST

Here the story takes the turn that makes it worth telling, because being first is not at all the same as winning.

Computer Motion and Intuitive Surgical spent the early 2000s locked in bitter, expensive patent litigation, each accusing the other of trespassing on its inventions. It was the classic collision of two pioneers whose fences overlapped: the field was new, the foundational patents were broad, and there was no way for both companies to operate without one arguing the other was standing on its ground. The lawsuits multiplied. The money drained away into lawyers on both sides. And in 2003 the war ended in the way such wars so often do — not with a verdict, but with a merger. Intuitive Surgical absorbed Computer Motion, took the technology and the patents it wanted, and quietly retired ZEUS. Within a few years the rival system was gone from the market, its best ideas folded into the victor.

It is a pattern you will meet again and again in this book, in field after field. The company that gets somewhere first — that proves the idea can work, clears the regulatory path, fights and pays for the early battles — is frequently not the company that ends up profiting

from it. The pioneer takes the arrows. The settler, arriving a little later with more capital and better timing, takes the land. Computer Motion was a pioneer in the truest sense: it put the first surgical robot into an operating theatre. And it was outlasted.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

AESOP's foundational patent expired in 2016, six years before da Vinci's flagship instrument. The robot that held the camera — the first of its kind to be trusted in an operating theatre — is now public property. The specific mechanism it protected, the automated and optimal positioning of a surgical endoscope, belongs to anyone who wants to use it.

There is a small, quiet justice in that. In the marketplace, Computer Motion lost to Intuitive; the company is gone, its name a footnote. But in law, its foundational idea has outlived the fight entirely. The patent's monopoly has expired, and the invention beneath it has passed into the commons, where it can seed the next generation of surgical machines without anyone needing permission or paying a toll. The pioneer's real legacy was never going to be a company or a share price. It was always going to be this: the knowledge itself, proven, published, and — now — set free.

CHAPTER 3

THE KEYHOLE REVOLUTION

Anchor patent: US 5,704,534 — "Articulation assembly for surgical instruments." Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc., granted 1998. Cited by 3,426 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2016.

Every so often a whole revolution in medicine turns out to rest on a single small joint.

By the middle of the 1990s, keyhole surgery had run into a problem it could not solve with rigid tools. Working through a small port in the body wall, a surgeon could push an instrument in and out, spin it around its own long axis, and swing it about the fixed pivot of the incision — and that was the whole of it. The tip could not bend. It could not turn aside to face a structure lying off at an angle, or reach around behind something, or present a needle squarely to the tissue the way stitching demands. For simple, straight-ahead operations this

was tolerable. For anything intricate, deep, or awkwardly placed — sewing, reconstructing, working in a corner the port did not point at — it was a wall.

The answer was to put a wrist, or at the very least a knuckle, into the instrument itself: a controllable joint, down at the working end, inside the patient, that the surgeon could bend to reach a target and then lock rigid so it would hold its position against the push and resistance of living tissue. Bend to reach; lock to work. Described in a sentence it sounds trivial, even obvious. Making it real was anything but. The joint had to work at a scale of a few millimetres. It had to be driven from a handle thirty centimetres away, through the narrow shaft of the instrument, by a surgeon whose hands were busy. And once bent, it had to be strong enough to hold its angle firmly while the tip cut, gripped, and sewed. A wobbly joint is worse than no joint at all.

THE COMPANY BEHIND THE STITCH

Ethicon is not a household name, but its handiwork is inside a startling fraction of the world's operations. A division of the vast Johnson & Johnson empire, it made its reputation on the unglamorous essentials of surgery — the sutures, the needles, the staplers, the tools that close a body back up after the dramatic part is done. When keyhole surgery arrived and began to remake the profession, Ethicon poured engineering into the instruments that

would let surgeons do more and more through ever-smaller openings. The articulating joint was one of its prizes.

US 5,704,534, granted in 1998, is titled simply an "articulation assembly for surgical instruments." Behind that plain phrase is the mechanism that lets the business end of a laparoscopic instrument bend to a controlled angle and then hold there against the resistance of the tissue it is working on. It is, in the end, the difference between a stick and an arm — between an instrument that can only point where it entered and one that can turn to meet its work.

WHY A JOINT MATTERED SO MUCH

Consider what a bending, locking tip actually buys a surgeon. It restores the ability to approach a target from the natural direction, rather than from whatever single line the port happens to allow. It lets the instrument reach behind and around structures instead of only coming at them head-on. Most of all, it makes suturing through a keyhole into something a mortal surgeon can learn, because the needle can finally be presented at the right angle to the tissue instead of skidding off it. Multiply that one capability across every laparoscopic procedure performed in the decades since — the reconstructions, the repairs, the delicate joins — and the humble articulating joint is quietly responsible for an enormous share of the operations that now leave a patient with nothing but a few small scars.

The citation record tells the same story from the patent office's side of the desk. More than 3,400 later inventions reference this single patent — a dense thicket of successors, refinements, and rivals, all circling the same fundamental need. When that many inventors keep returning to one document over twenty years, it is a sign that the document sits on top of a problem the entire field has to solve. This one did.

THE PREMIUM AND THE PROMISE

There is an economic story braided through this technical one, and it matters. For the two decades that the good mechanisms of keyhole surgery were owned — the articulating joints, the energy sealers, the clever staplers — the instruments that used them were premium products, priced accordingly. Minimally invasive surgery, for all its benefits to patients, was in large part a technology of wealthy hospitals in wealthy countries. The joint that made delicate keyhole work possible was, for a long time, something you had to be able to afford.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

The articulation patent expired in 2016. The particular bend-and-lock mechanism at the heart of a generation of keyhole instruments is now free for anyone to make.

That matters more than it might first appear. As the foundational patents of the keyhole era lapse one by one, the door opens: to cheaper instruments, to manufacturers who could never have afforded a licence, to the slow spread of minimally invasive surgery into the hospitals and the countries that were priced out of the first two decades of it. The revolution the joint enabled was, for twenty years, a premium good. Now the mechanism belongs to everyone — and the revolution it started can finally finish spreading to the people who were left out of it.

PART TWO — READING AND SEEING THE BODY

. . . .

CHAPTER 4

THE GENE CHIP

Anchor patent: US 5,744,305 — "Arrays of materials attached to a substrate." Affymetrix, Inc., granted 1998. Cited by 1,376 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2015.

For most of the twentieth century, reading a gene was slow, artisanal, one-at-a-time work. A scientist might spend weeks coaxing a single gene into revealing whether it was active in a tissue, and months building up a picture of a handful of genes together. The human genome, when its scale finally came into view, held something like twenty thousand genes. At the pace of one experiment per gene, understanding what they all did — which ones switched on to drive a cancer, which fell silent in a disease, which rose and fell together as a cell went about its business — was not a research programme so much as a life sentence handed to an entire field.

What biology needed was a way to ask thousands of questions at once, in a single experiment, on a single afternoon. It found that way in the most unlikely of neighbours: the factory that makes computer chips.

PRINTING BIOLOGY WITH LIGHT

The insight belonged to Stephen Fodor and his colleagues, and it was genuinely audacious. The semiconductor industry already knew how to build fantastically intricate patterns onto a small square of material using a technique called photolithography. Shine light through a patterned mask, and chemistry happens only where the light falls; move the mask, shine again, and you build up a structure of breathtaking complexity, layer by layer, spot by microscopic spot. It is how the transistors on a microchip are laid down by the billion. Fodor's team asked a strange and brilliant question: what if you used the same light-and-mask trick not to build circuits, but to build DNA?

Here is how it works. You coat a small glass surface with chemical building blocks, each one capped with a special molecular lock — a cap that only light can remove. Now you shine light through a mask so that only certain spots are exposed. At those spots, and only those, the lock pops open and the building block can accept the next DNA letter — an A, say. Wash away the excess, change the mask, shine light on a different set of spots, and add the next letter there. Repeat

this, letter by letter and mask by mask, and you grow hundreds of thousands of short, precisely known DNA sequences — called probes — each anchored at its own exact address on the chip. You have, in effect, printed a vast library of DNA onto a square of glass smaller than a postage stamp, with a detailed map of what sits where.

That is the GeneChip, and US 5,744,305 — "Arrays of materials attached to a substrate" — is the patent on the idea beneath it: many different chemical sequences, built and anchored at defined positions on a surface. It is written in the careful, abstract language of chemistry, generalised so far that it barely mentions DNA. But what it describes is a printing press for the molecules of life.

WHAT YOU CAN DO WITH A MILLION QUESTIONS

The point of all those addressed probes is that DNA is exquisitely choosy about what it sticks to. A single strand of DNA will bind tightly and specifically to its matching partner and ignore almost everything else. So drop a prepared sample of a patient's genetic material onto the chip, and it will find and stick to its matching probes, wherever they sit — and those spots light up. Read the pattern of lit spots and you are reading, in one glance, which of the tens of thousands of sequences on the chip are present or active in that sample.

Suddenly the impossible became routine. You could look at a tumour

and see, in a single experiment, which genes were roaring and which were silent — and compare that fingerprint to a healthy cell. You could tell one subtype of leukaemia from another by its pattern of gene activity, and treat them differently because you finally knew they were different. You could screen a person's genome for thousands of known variants at once. The whole idea of personalised medicine — that treatment might one day be tailored to the molecular fingerprint of a particular patient and their particular disease — needed exactly this: a cheap, fast way to read the fingerprint. The microarray gave it one, and genomics turned almost overnight from a cottage craft into an industrial enterprise.

The patent has been cited well over a thousand times, and its influence runs through the entire genomic revolution that followed.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

The array patent expired in 2015. The method of building an addressed library of biological probes on a surface — the core idea of the gene chip — is now anyone's to use.

Genomics moves fast, and twenty years is an age within it; newer sequencing technologies, some of them descendants of the very next chapter, have overtaken the microarray for many of the jobs it once did alone. But that is exactly the point of the public domain. The founding conceptual leap — read everything at once, in parallel, on a

surface, by letting DNA find its own matches — is woven into the tools that replaced it, and it now sits free for the taking. Every lab, every start-up, every student who comes next inherits it as a foundation stone they did not have to pay for.

CHAPTER 5

SEQUENCING BY LIGHT

Anchor patent: US 6,210,891 — "Method of sequencing DNA."
Pyrosequencing AB, granted 2001. Cited by 1,380 later inventions.
Entered the public domain in 2019.

To read the exact sequence of a strand of DNA — the precise order of its four letters, A, C, G and T — was, for decades, a painstaking laboratory ritual. The classic method, which earned Frederick Sanger the second of his two Nobel Prizes, worked by making copies of the DNA that stopped at each successive letter, then separating those fragments by size by dragging them through a gel with an electric field and reading off the ladder of bands that resulted. It was ingenious, it was reliable, and it was hopelessly slow and cumbersome for the scale that medicine would come to demand. Reading a single human genome by that method was a globe-spanning, decade-long, billion-dollar enterprise.

The breakthrough in this chapter reads DNA in an entirely different spirit. Instead of separating fragments after the fact, it watches DNA being built, one letter at a time, and catches each letter in the act of joining.

A FLASH OF LIGHT FOR EVERY LETTER

The chemistry was worked out by Pal Nyren and, with him, Mostafa Ronaghi, in Sweden, and it is a small marvel of elegance. When a strand of DNA is being copied and the next matching letter clicks into place on the growing chain, the reaction releases a tiny by-product molecule called pyrophosphate. On its own, that release is silent and invisible. Nyren's insight was to bolt on a cascade of enzymes that seizes the pyrophosphate and, through a couple of chemical steps, converts it into a pulse of visible light — the same kind of light-producing chemistry a firefly uses.

Now the trick reveals itself. You supply the copying reaction with just one kind of letter at a time: first a flood of Ts, then a flood ofGs, then Cs, then As, over and over. And you watch. When you add a letter that matches the next position on the template, it joins the chain, pyrophosphate is released, and the mixture flashes. When you add a letter that does not match, nothing happens and it stays dark. Even better, if the template calls for two or three of the same letter in a row, two or three join at once and the flash is correspondingly brighter — so the light tells you not just which letter, but how many.

String the sequence of flashes together and you have read the DNA, in real time, with no gel and no electrophoresis at all.

They called it pyrosequencing — sequencing by the light of pyrophosphate. US 6,210,891, plainly titled "Method of sequencing DNA," protects the approach.

THE ROAD TO THE CHEAP GENOME

Pyrosequencing's deepest importance was as a bridge to something larger. Its guiding principle — sequencing by synthesis, reading DNA by watching it being copied rather than by taking it apart afterwards — became the beating heart of the "next-generation" sequencing machines that arrived through the 2000s and changed biology forever. The leap those machines made was to run the reaction not once but on hundreds of thousands, and then millions, of DNA fragments in parallel, all at the same time, on a single chip or slide. Massively parallel sequencing by synthesis collapsed the cost of reading a human genome from billions of pounds to, within a decade or so, a few hundred.

It is hard to overstate what that cost collapse unlocked. Cancer genomics, in which a tumour's own mutations are read to choose a targeted drug. The rapid identification of a brand-new virus from a patient sample — as the world would come to depend on. The tracing of an outbreak in near real time by reading how a pathogen

mutates as it spreads. The sequencing of a desperately ill newborn's genes overnight to diagnose a rare disease before it does irreversible harm. All of it rides on the idea of reading DNA as it is written, letter by letter, in parallel and at scale. More than 1,300 later patents cite this one, tracing a clear line of descent from a clever enzyme cascade in a Swedish laboratory to the entire sequencing industry that followed.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

The pyrosequencing patent expired in 2019. The method of reading DNA by the light of its own synthesis is now free to all.

As so often in this fast-moving field, the specific chemistry has been overtaken by faster, cheaper successors — that is simply what happens in sequencing, generation after generation. But the founding idea it protected, sequencing by synthesis, is the ancestor of them all, and it has now passed into the commons. It remains part of the shared toolkit of anyone learning to read the code of life, a technique nobody owns and everybody may use.

CHAPTER 6

MAKING DISEASE GLOW

Anchor patent: US 8,298,677 — "Fluorescent silica-based nanoparticles." Cornell Research Foundation, granted 2012. Cited by 1,426 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2023.

A surgeon removing a tumour faces a quietly terrible question, and faces it in real time, with a scalpel in hand: where does the cancer end? Tumour tissue and healthy tissue can look and feel maddeningly alike. The edge of a cancer is not a clean line but a smudge, and its outposts — the few cells that have wandered off to seed the next tumour, or the lymph node that has quietly filled with disease — can be invisible to the naked eye. Cut too little, and cancer is left behind to regrow. Cut too much, and healthy structures the patient needs are needlessly destroyed. For all the sophistication of modern medicine, that margin is very often judged by a surgeon's eye and gloved fingertip in the moment, under pressure.

What if the cancer could simply be made to glow?

THE BRIGHTEST POSSIBLE SPECK

The tool in this chapter is a particle so small it strains the imagination — a bead of silica, ordinary glass in its chemistry, just a few billionths of a metre across, with fluorescent dye molecules locked inside it. The obvious approach, injecting a fluorescent dye on its own to light up a tumour, had long disappointed: free dye is dim, it scatters and blurs, it does not go where you want it, and the body clears it awkwardly. The trick, developed over years in the laboratory of Ulrich Wiesner at Cornell, was to trap the dye inside a tiny, precisely made cage of silica. Caged this way, the dye glows far more brightly and far more stably than it does floating free — the silica shell protects and concentrates it — and the surface of the particle can be decorated to steer it toward tumour cells and to let the body clear away the rest cleanly and safely.

The result, nicknamed "Cornell dots," or C dots, is in effect the brightest safe speck you can inject into a human being: a fluorescent marker small enough to travel through the body, engineered to gather at a tumour and light it up for a camera, or for a surgeon's own eye through a special scope. US 8,298,677 — "Fluorescent silica-based nanoparticles" — protects the particle and the way it is made.

NANOTECHNOLOGY THAT ACTUALLY REACHED THE

CLINIC

Nanomedicine has made a great many dazzling promises over the years, and kept rather fewer of them than its early enthusiasts hoped. Particles that would hunt down cancer, ferry drugs to precise addresses, and rebuild tissue from within have a way of shining in the laboratory and then stalling on the long, brutal road to a real patient. What makes this one worth a chapter is that it actually made the journey. Cornell dots became one of the first inorganic nanoparticles cleared to enter human clinical trials — tested in patients for exactly the job they were designed to do: lighting up the margins of a cancer and the lymph nodes to which it might have spread, so that a surgeon could see what to remove and what to spare.

That is the dream of image-guided surgery made concrete: operating not by feel and educated guesswork, but by a map of the disease glowing in the tissue itself. The patent's citation count, north of 1,400, reflects the burst of work that followed — other particles, other coatings, other clever ways to make the invisible visible inside a living body.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

This is the youngest patent in the book, and its expiry is the most recent — 2023. That is worth pausing on, because it reveals

something about how the timer works. A patent's twenty years run from the date it is filed, not the date it is finally granted. This one was filed back in 2003 and took the better part of a decade to issue, so although it was granted only in 2012, its twenty-year clock had been running since 2003 — and it reached the public domain in 2023, barely a decade after it was formally granted. A genuinely modern piece of nanotechnology is already common property.

The particle that makes disease glow now belongs to everyone. In a field where the next advance so often comes from combining existing, proven pieces in a new arrangement, having a clinic-ready fluorescent nanoparticle sitting free in the public domain is a real gift — to every researcher, every start-up, and ultimately every surgeon trying to see the true edge of a cancer before they cut.

PART THREE — ENGINEERING THE ANTIBODY

. . .

CHAPTER 7

MAKING ANTIBODIES HUMAN

Anchor patent: US 5,585,089 — "Humanized immunoglobulins." Protein Design Labs, Inc., granted 1996. Cited by 2,723 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2015.

The antibody is one of the most exquisite weapons the living world has ever produced. It is a Y-shaped protein, and its job is precision: it latches onto one specific target — a particular virus, a particular toxin, a marker on the surface of a particular cancer cell — and, having found it, marks it for the immune system to destroy. Your body makes millions of different antibodies, a vast library of shapes, so that whatever new threat appears there is likely to be one already able to grip it. For more than a century, doctors dreamed of borrowing this precision: of making antibodies to order and using them as drugs, guided missiles aimed at a single disease and nothing else.

By the 1980s, thanks to a Nobel-winning technique for making antibodies in unlimited, identical supply, they could finally do it. They could raise an antibody against almost any target they chose. And there the dream stalled, on a cruel technicality.

THE REJECTION PROBLEM

The antibodies were made in mice. And a mouse antibody, injected into a human being, is recognised by the human immune system for exactly what it is: foreign. The body mounts a response against the very drug meant to help it, treating the therapeutic antibody as an intruder to be neutralised. At best this blunted the drug's effect, clearing it from the body before it could do its work; at worst it caused dangerous reactions. The most specific, most promising medicines anyone could imagine were being rejected for the crime of being murine. The precision was real, but the body would not accept the messenger.

Scientists tried the obvious brute-force fix — making the antibody a bit less mouse and a bit more human by swapping whole sections — but crude swaps tended to wreck the delicate grip that made the antibody worth having in the first place. The target-binding and the human-acceptability seemed to be at war. What was needed was a scalpel, not a hammer.

GRAFTING THE HUMAN FRAME

The solution is a piece of molecular tailoring so clever that, in hindsight, it looks almost obvious. Look closely at an antibody and you find it is not uniform. There are the tiny loops at the very tips of the Y — a handful of short, hyper-variable stretches — that actually make contact with the target and do the gripping. And there is the large, relatively constant scaffold that holds those loops in the right position and carries out the rest of the antibody's work. Crucially, the specificity lives almost entirely in the little loops; the scaffold is mostly what the immune system reads as "self" or "foreign."

So: keep only the mouse's tiny target-gripping loops — the part whose exact shape took the mouse's immune system its genius to design — and graft them onto an otherwise entirely human scaffold. The finished antibody binds its target with a mouse's precision, but wears a human frame the body accepts as its own. This is "humanization," and while the broad idea had precursors, it was Cary Queen and his colleagues at Protein Design Labs who worked out how to do it well — how to make the graft actually take, preserving the delicate three-dimensional shape of the binding loops on their new human backbone, keeping the grip intact even as almost everything around it became human. Doing that reliably required understanding which few extra scaffold positions had to be kept mouse-like to support the loops, and that hard-won know-how is the heart of the invention. US 5,585,089, "Humanized immunoglobulins," is the result.

THE PATENT BENEATH THE MEDICINE CABINET

It is hard to overstate what this unlocked. Humanized antibodies became one of the most important classes of medicine of the modern era — a whole new kind of drug. The antibody that transformed one of the most aggressive forms of breast cancer from a near-certain death sentence into a treatable disease is a humanized antibody. So are the drugs that calm the wild, joint-destroying inflammation of rheumatoid arthritis, and the ones that quiet Crohn's disease, and the ones that hold back the blood vessels a tumour grows to feed itself, and the ones that damp the runaway allergic cascade of severe asthma. An astonishing proportion of the biological medicines that reshaped treatment from the late 1990s onward are humanized antibodies — and for two decades, a great many of them owed something to these foundational patents.

Protein Design Labs built much of its existence on licensing that intellectual property; the "Queen patents" became one of the most significant patent estates in all of biotechnology. The citation count — more than 2,700 later inventions — barely begins to capture the reach, because it counts only other patents, not the drugs, the companies, and the treated patients downstream. When a single invention sits beneath a whole generation of blockbuster medicines, its influence runs not just through laboratories but through economies and clinics and the lives of people who never hear its name.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

The humanization patents reached the end of their term around 2014 and 2015. The core method of giving a mouse antibody a human frame — the technique that made antibody drugs possible in the first place — is now public property.

The timing matters, commercially and humanely both. As these foundational patents lapse, so do many of the licensing tolls and legal obstacles that once sat between a new antibody and the clinic. It becomes easier, and cheaper, for others to make antibody medicines — including the "biosimilar" versions that arrive after the originals' protection ends and pull the once-astronomical prices of these drugs downward. The idea that took a decade and a fortune to establish is now a free starting line. And the patients who depend on antibody medicines — for their cancer, their arthritis, their Crohn's — are, slowly and unevenly, the beneficiaries of the fence coming down.

CHAPTER 8

TUNING THE ANTIBODY'S AIM

Anchor patent: US 5,624,821 — "Antibodies with altered effector functions." Scotgen Biopharmaceuticals, Inc., granted 1997. Cited by 1,289 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2015.

An antibody does two things at once, with its two different ends, and the previous chapter was only about the first of them. With the tips of its arms, it grips its specific target. But with its other end — the stem of the Y, known as the Fc region, or the "tail" — it calls for help. Having locked onto a virus or a cancer cell, the antibody's tail acts as a kind of molecular signal flare, summoning the immune system's heavy weapons: the scavenger cells that engulf and devour whatever the antibody has marked, and a cascade of blood proteins, called complement, that can punch holes directly in the target's membrane. Binding finds the enemy; the tail decides what happens to it.

For a drug designer, that second function opens a tantalising possibility. If the tail governs which weapons are summoned and how loudly, then editing the tail should let you tune what the antibody does after it binds. Make the tail shout, and the antibody becomes a more ferocious killer — exactly what you want when the target is a cancer cell you wish to see destroyed. Make the tail whisper, or fall silent, and the antibody can block or neutralise its target quietly, without calling down destruction — exactly what you want when you are trying to calm an overactive immune system, or gently switch off a signal, rather than start a fight.

THE KNOB BEHIND THE DRUG

The patent in this chapter, from Scotgen Biopharmaceuticals, is about precisely that knob: antibodies deliberately engineered with altered effector functions — a tail modified to strengthen or to weaken the immune response it recruits. Its importance is conceptual as much as technical. It recognised, and staked out in law, that specificity — the target-gripping that everyone had been focused on — was only half of what makes an antibody a useful medicine. What the antibody did once it arrived at its target could, and should, be designed too. The antibody was not a fixed natural object to be aimed; it was a device with a back end that could be tuned.

This turned the antibody from a simple homing device into a fully tunable drug. The very same target-gripping loops could now be

paired with a tail dialled up for aggressive cell-killing, or a tail dialled down to a quiet block, depending entirely on what the disease demanded. A cancer therapy and an anti-inflammatory therapy might grip completely different targets, but both could now be built on a deliberately engineered tail chosen for its effect. More than 1,200 later inventions cite this idea, a measure of how thoroughly the field came to accept that the antibody's back end was a design surface in its own right, and not merely a fixed inheritance from the mouse or the human it came from.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

The patent expired in 2015, alongside the humanization patents of the previous chapter — and it is right that the two should reach the public domain together, because they belong together. Humanization made antibodies safe to give to people at all; effector-function engineering made them precise in what they did once given. Between them, they turned the antibody from a natural curiosity that the body rejected into a fully engineerable therapeutic platform — a thing you could design, from both ends, to do exactly what a particular disease required.

That platform is now, in its foundations, public. The principle that you can retune an antibody's immune signalling by editing its tail is common knowledge and common property, free for the next generation of antibody designers to build upon without asking

anyone's leave or paying anyone's toll.

CHAPTER 9

THE NEXT-GENERATION FC

Anchor patent: US 6,737,056 — "Polypeptide variants with altered effector function." Genentech, Inc., granted 2004. Cited by 1,238 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2020.

Genentech was the company that, more than any other single institution, turned the young science of molecular biology into an industry of medicines. Founded in the late 1970s at the very dawn of genetic engineering, it proved that the tools of the laboratory could make real drugs — insulin, growth hormone, clot-busters, and then a parade of antibodies — and in doing so it more or less invented the biotechnology business. So it is fitting that the maturing of antibody engineering, the step from a clever idea into a reliable industrial design rulebook, should carry Genentech's name.

By the late 1990s the principle from the previous chapter was

established and accepted: an antibody's tail governs the immune response it recruits, and editing the tail retunes the drug. What remained was to do it precisely — to map out, position by position, which specific changes to the antibody's constant region produce which specific effects, and by how much. Not merely "make it shout or whisper," but a detailed, quantitative catalogue: change this particular amino acid here, and the antibody recruits the cell-killing response far more strongly; change that one there, and it engages the complement cascade differently; combine these two, and you get a precisely dialled result. The difference between knowing that a knob exists and knowing the exact number each setting turns to.

FROM ART TO ENGINEERING

US 6,737,056, "Polypeptide variants with altered effector function," is that catalogue in patent form. It describes antibody variants carrying defined, specific changes that boost the immune functions most useful in a therapy — in particular, the ability to direct the body's own killer cells to destroy a target the antibody has marked, the mechanism known by its initials as ADCC. For a cancer drug, that mechanism is very often the whole game. An antibody that merely binds a tumour cell and blocks one of its signals is useful; but an antibody that binds a tumour cell and then efficiently recruits the immune system to kill it is a far more powerful medicine. Being able to engineer that killing power up, reliably and by design, was a significant prize.

This is what it means for a field to mature. The first patents in a lineage stake out the big idea, often broadly and roughly. The later ones, like this one, turn that idea into a set of dependable, repeatable, characterised design choices. An antibody engineer could now reach for specific, well-understood modifications the way a builder reaches for standard, spec-sheet parts, confident of what each one would do to the finished drug. The result was a generation of more potent antibody therapies, engineered from the very outset for the exact immune effect their target disease demanded — designed, not merely discovered.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

This patent expired in 2020, and with it a key piece of the modern antibody engineer's toolkit passed into the public domain. The catalogue of tail modifications — the difference between a merely serviceable antibody and a finely, deliberately tuned one — is now shared knowledge, free to use.

Read the three patents of this section as one story and an arc appears. Humanization (Chapter 7) made antibodies acceptable to the human body at all. Effector-function engineering (Chapter 8) made them tunable, establishing that the tail was a design surface. And this final refinement (Chapter 9) made that tuning precise, quantitative, and industrial. Each was, in its day, a piece of guarded intellectual property sitting at the heart of a valuable business and a wall of

licensing agreements. And each, in turn — 2015, 2015, 2020 — has had its fence taken down. The whole engine of modern antibody design, assembled over two decades behind that wall, has been handed over piece by piece to everyone who comes next. The guided missiles of medicine are now built from open blueprints.

PART FOUR — THE BODY, CONTINUOUSLY MONITORED

. . .

CHAPTER 10

THE SENSOR THAT NEVER SLEEPS

Anchor patent: US 6,175,752 — "Analyte monitoring device and methods of use." TheraSense, Inc. (E. Heller & Company), granted 2001. Cited by 2,523 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2018.

For most of the history of diabetes care, a person with the condition lived by the fingerstick. Several times a day — before meals, before bed, before driving, whenever something felt wrong — the same small ritual: the lancet, the bead of blood squeezed from a fingertip, the test strip, the meter, a number. And that number, hard-won and slightly painful, was only ever a single snapshot of a value that was in truth rising and falling continuously, all day and all night, with every meal and every walk and every hour of sleep. Between the snapshots lay darkness. A blood sugar sliding dangerously low in the small hours might not be caught until morning, if it was caught at all.

The single most important number in a diabetic's life was one they could only glimpse, a handful of times a day, by drawing their own blood.

The dream was obvious and old: a sensor that stays in the body and reads continuously, turning those scattered, painful snapshots into a smooth, unbroken line — a live graph of the blood sugar, updating minute by minute. The difficulty was never the dream. It was the chemistry.

WIRING AN ENZYME

Measuring glucose electrically relies on an enzyme — a biological catalyst that reacts specifically with glucose and, in doing so, shuffles electrons about. In principle, capture those electrons as a tiny electric current and you can measure the glucose. In practice, getting that signal out cleanly, reliably, from the warm, wet, moving, protein-rich environment just under the skin, hour after hour and day after day without the sensor drifting or fouling or provoking the body, was a problem that had defeated many good scientists. The electrons had to travel from deep inside the enzyme to an electrode, and that final hop was slow, leaky, and unreliable.

Adam Heller, a chemist of real ingenuity, cracked it with an idea he called the "wired enzyme." He designed a special polymer studded with molecules that shuttle electrons easily — a soft, flexible

substance that acts, in effect, as a molecular wire, reaching into the glucose-sensing enzyme and carrying the electrons of its reaction directly and efficiently out to a tiny electrode. The enzyme was, quite literally, plugged in. The signal that had been faint and unreliable became clean, strong, and readable. Heller's company, TheraSense, built this chemistry into a sensor small enough to sit under the skin and read glucose continuously and stably. US 6,175,752, "Analyte monitoring device and methods of use," protects the device and the way it works.

A LINE INSTEAD OF DOTS

The consequence was a quiet revolution in a disease that touches hundreds of millions of people. Continuous glucose monitoring replaced the fingerstick's lonely, disconnected dots with a live, flowing graph — a fresh reading every few minutes, a trend arrow showing which way the number is heading and how fast, and, most precious of all, an alarm. A sensor that reads all night can wake a sleeping person, or the parent of a sleeping child, before a silent overnight low becomes a catastrophe. For the family of a small child with type 1 diabetes, that alarm turned a nightly, sleepless dread into a manageable signal that could be trusted to sound in time. Diabetes remained a relentless, demanding condition — but for the first time its central number was visible in real time, a line you could watch rather than a series of guesses you strung together.

With more than 2,500 later inventions citing it, this is one of the most built-upon patents in the entire book. Nearly every continuous glucose monitor worn today, and very nearly every step toward an automated insulin system, traces some part of its lineage back to the idea of wiring an enzyme directly to an electrode and reading the body without drawing blood.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

The wired-enzyme sensor patent expired in 2018. The foundational chemistry of continuous glucose monitoring is now in the public domain.

That expiry arrives at an interesting moment, because continuous monitoring is spreading well beyond diabetes — into sport and fitness, into the broad and growing world of wearables, into the general idea that an ordinary person might one day read their own body's chemistry in real time as casually as they now read their heart rate on a watch. With the founding patent free, that spread has one fewer barrier and one fewer toll in front of it. The sensor that never sleeps belongs to everyone now.

CHAPTER 11

THE SENSOR THAT CALIBRATES ITSELF

Anchor patent: US 6,558,321 — "Systems and methods for remote monitoring and modulation of medical devices." Dexcom, Inc., granted 2003. Cited by 1,317 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2020.

A sensor buried in the body is only as good as the number it reports, and a glucose sensor sitting in the tissue under the skin faces a relentless problem: it drifts. The chemistry ages over the days it is worn. The body, recognising a foreign object, begins to wall it off and react around it. The precise relationship between the raw electrical signal the sensor produces and the true glucose level in the blood shifts, hour by hour and day by day. A raw sensor, left entirely to its own devices, soon starts to lie — not dramatically, but enough that you could not safely make a decision about insulin, or trust an alarm, based on its unaided word.

The breakthrough of this chapter is not the sensor itself but the intelligent loop built around it — the system that keeps the sensor honest, and thereby turns a clever gadget into a trustworthy medical device.

CLOSING THE LOOP

Dexcom's contribution was to stop treating the implanted sensor as a self-contained thing and start treating it as one half of a partnership. The sensor sits in the body and does what it is good at: streaming out a continuous flow of raw readings. But the intelligence lives outside the body, in an external receiver with far more computing power than could ever be safely buried under the skin. That receiver takes in the raw stream, compares it against calibration points, models and corrects for the sensor's known drift, filters the noise, and produces a trustworthy number — and, crucially, it can send information and instructions back to the system to keep the whole arrangement accurate over time. Monitoring and modulation, remotely: sensing on the inside, thinking on the outside, and a constant conversation between the two.

US 6,558,321, "Systems and methods for remote monitoring and modulation of medical devices," describes exactly this architecture. It is a subtle shift, but a decisive one. The previous chapter gave us a sensor that could read glucose continuously; this one gives us the system that makes those continuous readings reliable enough to

actually act upon — to dose insulin by, to raise a life-saving alarm over, to hand safely to an automated pump.

THE TRUSTWORTHY NUMBER

It is easy to underrate this, precisely because when it works you never notice it. But the gap it closes is the whole difference between a toy and a tool. A sensor that produces a stream of numbers is a gadget. A sensor whose numbers you can safely base a life-and-death decision on — how much insulin to deliver to a child, whether to sound an alarm that will wake a household — is a medical device in the full and serious sense of the term. And the difference between the two is almost entirely the loop: the calibration, the drift correction, the external intelligence keeping the reading true as the sensor ages and the body fights it. Dexcom built its reputation, and much of the clinical credibility of continuous monitoring as a whole, on getting that loop right. The patent has been cited well over a thousand times by others building their own trustworthy sensing systems on the same principle.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

This patent expired in 2020. The architecture of a remotely monitored, self-correcting implanted sensor is now public.

That architecture reaches far beyond glucose. Almost any sensor

placed in or on the body and expected to stay accurate over days or weeks — and that is very nearly all of them — faces the same drift problem and needs the same kind of intelligent, self-calibrating loop wrapped around it. With this foundational approach now in the commons, the design pattern that turns a raw, drifting body sensor into a device you can genuinely trust is available, free, to everyone building the next generation of continuous health monitors. The number you can bet a life on is no longer anyone's private property.

CHAPTER 12

THE SMART INSULIN PUMP

Anchor patent: US 7,025,743 — "External infusion device with remote programming, bolus estimator and/or vibration alarm capabilities." Medtronic MiniMed, Inc., granted 2006. Cited by 2,711 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2023.

The two previous chapters gave us the eyes: sensors that read the body's glucose continuously and honestly. This chapter gives us the hands — the pump that acts on what the eyes see.

An insulin pump is a small device, worn on the body, that delivers insulin steadily through a fine tube under the skin instead of by repeated injection. The basic idea is not new; pumps had existed for years. What this chapter is about is the moment the pump grew a brain — the moment it stopped being merely a delivery mechanism and became an intelligent partner in the exhausting, unending work

of managing a disease that never takes a day off.

THE PUMP LEARNS TO THINK

Dosing insulin is, for the person with diabetes, a constant arithmetic problem, solved over and over, every single day, forever. Before a meal you must work out how much insulin to take, and the sum is genuinely fiddly: it depends on the carbohydrates you are about to eat, on your glucose reading right now, on how much insulin from your last dose is still active and working in your body, and on personal conversion factors that differ from one body to the next and even from morning to evening. Done by hand, many times a day, for a lifetime, it is not only exhausting but dangerous — because a mistake in the arithmetic is a mistake in the dose, and errors in insulin dosing hurt patients in both directions, too much and too little each carrying its own risk.

Medtronic MiniMed's patent describes a pump that shoulders that burden for the person wearing it. Its "bolus estimator" performs the meal-time calculation itself: you tell it the carbohydrates, it knows your recent doses and your settings, and it turns a fraught mental sum into a clear suggestion on a screen. The pump can be programmed and commanded remotely, so a dose can be set or adjusted without fumbling at the device itself under a restaurant table. And it adds a small, deeply humane touch that matters far more than it may sound: a vibration alarm, so the device can alert its

wearer discreetly — a private buzz rather than an electronic beep that announces a personal medical condition to a classroom, a meeting, or a crowded room. US 7,025,743 gathers these capabilities together into a single intelligent device.

TOWARD THE ARTIFICIAL PANCREAS

Read the three chapters of this section in order and you can watch a machine assembling itself, piece by piece. A sensor that reads glucose continuously (Chapter 10). A loop that makes those readings trustworthy enough to act upon (Chapter 11). And now a pump that can calculate doses, be commanded automatically, and warn its wearer discreetly (Chapter 12). Connect the trustworthy sensor to the intelligent pump, and let software close the gap between them, and you have the outline of an "artificial pancreas" — a closed loop in which the sensor tells the pump how much insulin to deliver, moment to moment, adjusting continuously, with the human at last freed from the endless, dangerous arithmetic. That is precisely the direction diabetes technology has taken in the years since, and the thinking pump is an indispensable component of it. Its more than 2,700 citations reflect how central the intelligent pump became to the whole endeavour.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

This patent expired in 2023. The design of an insulin pump that

estimates doses, accepts remote commands, and warns its wearer discreetly is now public property.

The importance here is not only technical but plainly economic and human. Diabetes technology is expensive, and that expense keeps it out of reach of many of the people who would benefit from it most — a cruelty, given that the disease is so widespread and its daily burden so heavy. As the foundational patents behind smart pumps and continuous sensors lapse, one after another — this one, and the sensors of the two previous chapters — the path opens toward cheaper devices and wider access. The separate pieces of the artificial pancreas, patented individually over two decades by different companies, are now falling into the public domain one by one, where anyone at all can pick them up and assemble them.

PART FIVE — REPAIRING AND REBUILDING

• • •

CHAPTER 13

ENERGY THAT SEALS FLESH

Anchor patent: US 6,602,252 — "Combined dissecting, cauterizing, and stapling device." Starion Instruments Corporation, granted 2003. Cited by 2,963 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2022.

Surgery is, to a degree the layperson rarely appreciates, a long battle against bleeding. Cut into a living tissue and it bleeds, because living tissue is threaded through with blood vessels, most of them far too small to see. A surgeon's art is as much about controlling that bleeding as about the cutting itself — keeping the field clear enough to see what they are doing, and returning the patient with their blood still in their body. For most of medical history the tools of cutting and the tools of sealing were separate things. You divided the tissue with a blade, and then, in a second and separate action, you stopped the bleeding — with a tie, a stitch, a clip, or a touch of heat from a cautery. Cut, then seal; cut, then seal. Every switch from one

instrument to another costs time, and in surgery time is not merely money. Time is blood, and risk, and a patient longer under anaesthetic.

The invention in this chapter collapses those separate steps into one.

THREE JOBS, ONE PASS

Starion Instruments built a device that dissects, cauterizes, and staples in a single, continuous motion. As it advances through the tissue it cuts; as it cuts, it uses controlled heat to seal the small vessels it crosses so that they never bleed in the first place; and it staples the divided edges together where they need to be secured — all in one pass of one instrument. What had been a repeated sequence of separate actions with separate tools became a single smooth stroke.

US 6,602,252, "Combined dissecting, cauterizing, and stapling device," protects that combination. The genius of it lies not in any one of the three functions on its own — surgeons already had blades, cauteries, and staplers, each perfectly good at its job. The genius is in the fusion: making the instrument that opens the tissue the very same instrument that seals and secures it, in the same motion, with no pause and no swapping of tools. It is a small idea stated plainly and an enormous one in the operating theatre.

WHY FUSION MATTERS

In minimally invasive surgery the value of that fusion multiplies. Every instrument in keyhole surgery must pass through a narrow port, and every exchange of one tool for another is an interruption — a small ceremony of withdrawing, handing over, receiving, reinserting, and finding your place again. A device that does three jobs at once means dramatically fewer of those interruptions. It means less bleeding, because vessels are sealed the instant they are cut rather than pursued afterwards. It means faster operations, because the surgeon's rhythm is not constantly broken. And it means safer surgery, because a field that is not filling with blood is a field the surgeon can actually see clearly enough to work in. The broader idea it helped establish — energy-based sealing, the use of precisely controlled heat to weld tissue shut as an integral part of the act of cutting — became one of the defining features of modern surgical instruments. With nearly 3,000 later inventions citing it, this patent sits close to the centre of that shift.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

The device patent expired in 2022. The principle of a combined cut-seal-staple instrument is now free for anyone to build.

As with the keyhole instruments of Chapter 3, the deepest practical consequence is access. Energy-based surgical tools have long been

premium products, protected by patents and priced to match, and for two decades the faster, safer surgery they enable was in part a privilege of the hospitals that could afford the branded instruments. As the foundational patents lapse, cheaper equivalents become possible to make and to buy, and the benefits — less bleeding, quicker operations, clearer fields — can spread to the hospitals and the countries for which the originals were simply out of reach. The single stroke that cuts and seals at once now belongs to everyone.

CHAPTER 14

REJOINING THE VESSELS

Anchor patent: US 5,695,504 — "Devices and methods for performing a vascular anastomosis." Heartport, Inc., granted 1997. Cited by 2,633 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2015.

To join two blood vessels together — a procedure surgeons call an anastomosis — is one of the most demanding tasks in all of surgery. The vessels are delicate, thin-walled, and slippery with blood. The join between them must be perfectly sealed, because any gap will leak with every single heartbeat, at pressure, for the rest of the patient's life. And in heart surgery this exquisite join must sometimes be made on tissue that is moving, in a space almost too small and too deep for a human hand to reach comfortably. Traditionally it is done the way it has been done for generations: sewn by hand, stitch by tiny stitch, with fine thread and finer needles — a skill that takes surgeons years to master and takes precious minutes to perform on

each join, minutes during which blood flow may be interrupted and the clock is always running.

Heartport set out to make that join faster, more consistent, and — above all — possible through much smaller openings than open surgery required.

SURGERY THROUGH A PORT

Heartport's larger ambition was minimally invasive heart surgery: operating on the heart and its great vessels without the enormous incision and the sawn-through, cracked-open breastbone that conventional cardiac surgery demanded. It is hard to overstate how brutal the standard approach is. To reach the heart, surgeons split the sternum lengthways and spread the chest; the patient is put on a heart-lung machine; and the recovery from the access alone — never mind the repair to the heart — is long and painful. Heartport imagined doing this gentler, through smaller openings between the ribs.

But that ambition ran headlong into the anastomosis problem. You cannot simply ask a surgeon to hand-sew a perfect, leak-proof vessel join through a keyhole as readily as through a wide-open chest; the access that makes the surgery gentle is the same access that makes the hardest stitch nearly impossible. So Heartport developed devices and methods to perform the join mechanically — using staples and

specialised instruments to connect vessels quickly and reliably, without the full painstaking hand-sewing, and without the excessive handling that might bruise or damage the fragile vessel walls. US 5,695,504, "Devices and methods for performing a vascular anastomosis," captures this. At its heart it is an attempt to take the single hardest manual skill in vascular and cardiac surgery and turn it into something a device can help perform, consistently, through a small opening.

THE LONG PUSH TOWARD THE GENTLE OPERATION

The wider story here is the long, patient campaign to make heart surgery less of an assault on the body. Conventional cardiac surgery saves enormous numbers of lives, and nothing here diminishes that. But it does so at a heavy cost to the patient — the split breastbone, the heart-lung machine with its own risks, the months of recovery. Every step that lets a heart operation be done through smaller incisions, with less disruption, on a body that will heal faster, is a step worth taking, and generations of surgeons and engineers have pushed in that direction. Reliable, rapid vessel-joining is one of the essential pieces of that puzzle — which is why this patent has been cited more than 2,600 times by those pursuing gentler cardiac and vascular surgery in the years since.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

The anastomosis patent expired in 2015. The methods it protected for joining vessels mechanically, through smaller openings, are now in the public domain.

Minimally invasive and beating-heart techniques have advanced enormously since Heartport's day, and much has been learned that the original patent never imagined. But those advances build on foundations like this one — and those foundations are now free for anyone to build upon in turn. The hardest stitch in surgery, and the family of tools devised to make it easier and gentler, have passed into the common inheritance of the field.

CHAPTER 15

A REFILLABLE IMPLANT FOR THE BRAIN

Anchor patent: US 5,554,148 — "Renewable neural implant device and method." Brown University Research Foundation, granted 1996. Cited by 1,434 later inventions. Entered the public domain in 2015.

Some of the cruellest diseases of the brain come down, in the end, to a missing molecule. In Parkinson's disease, a specific population of brain cells — the ones that manufacture a crucial signalling chemical — sickens and dies away, and as they vanish the body loses its smooth control of movement. In certain forms of chronic pain, and in a number of other neurological conditions, the underlying story is similar: the right therapeutic substance, delivered to exactly the right place in the brain and kept there steadily, could help enormously. The obstacle is delivery. A drug swallowed or injected into the bloodstream is largely stopped at the brain's tightly guarded border, the blood-brain barrier, and even what gets through is soon cleared

away. To help, the medicine must be made or released continuously, precisely where it is needed, for years — and the brain does not welcome tubes and repeated surgeries.

The idea in this chapter is startling in both its simplicity and its daring: do not keep delivering the medicine from outside. Implant a tiny factory that makes it on the spot — a factory built out of living cells.

A CAPSULE OF LIVING CELLS

The device is a small capsule holding living cells, chosen precisely because they naturally secrete a desired therapeutic molecule. The clever part is the capsule's wall: a semi-permeable membrane, a barrier with pores of a carefully chosen size. It lets the small therapeutic molecules the cells produce pass out into the surrounding brain tissue, and lets the nutrients and oxygen the cells need pass in — while keeping the body's immune system out, so that the patient's defences cannot reach and destroy the foreign cells sheltered inside. Implanted in the brain, such a capsule becomes a continuous, local, living source of exactly the substance the diseased tissue lacks. The cells sense their surroundings and secrete; the membrane protects them and lets their product through; the brain receives a steady supply where an injected drug could never reach.

And this particular patent's device is renewable — designed so that it

can be refreshed or replenished rather than demanding fresh brain surgery to remove and replace each time it is exhausted. US 5,554,148, "Renewable neural implant device and method," growing out of work associated with Brown University, describes this encapsulated, refillable approach to treating neurological disease.

THE SEED OF CELL THERAPY

This was an early and influential expression of an idea that has only grown in importance in the decades since: cell therapy, the use of living cells themselves as a treatment. It is a genuinely different paradigm from the classical drug. Instead of a molecule manufactured in a factory, purified, and injected, the therapy is a population of living cells, placed within the body, doing what cells do best — sensing their environment and manufacturing the right molecules in response, continuously, over time. The central obstacle to that paradigm had always been how to put foreign cells into a person without the immune system destroying them, or the cells running wild. Encapsulation offered an elegant answer: house them behind a membrane that shields them from attack while letting their helpful output escape. More than 1,400 later inventions cite this patent, tracing a line of descent to the encapsulated cell therapies and implantable biological devices explored ever since.

AND THEN THE FENCE CAME DOWN

This patent expired in 2015. The concept of a renewable, encapsulated cell implant for treating neurological disease is now public property.

Cell therapy is today one of the most active and hopeful frontiers in all of medicine, and foundational ideas like this — how to safely house living therapeutic cells inside the body and keep them working — are exactly the kind of groundwork the field continues to build upon. That groundwork is now free. The notion of a tiny, refillable, living factory implanted precisely where the body needs it belongs to everyone who would carry the idea forward.

CHAPTER 16

SCAFFOLDS FOR NEW TISSUE

Anchor patents: US 5,891,558 — "Biopolymer foams for use in tissue repair and reconstruction" (Tissue Engineering Consultants, granted 1999); US 7,009,039 — "Plasma protein matrices and methods for their preparation" (ProChon Biotech, granted 2006); US 5,749,968 — surgical sealant gels (Focal, Inc., granted 1998). All now in the public domain.

The oldest dream in surgery is not to cut and stitch, but to regrow. Not to patch a hole with foreign material or replace a failed part with a machine, but to persuade the body to build new, living tissue of its own kind, in the place where tissue was lost. That dream has a modern name — regenerative medicine — and above all else it needs materials: scaffolds for new cells to grow into and organise themselves upon, and glues that can hold living things together in the wet and moving environment of the body. This closing chapter

gathers three patents that supplied exactly those materials, and in doing so it brings us to the frontier that most fully expresses what all of medicine is ultimately reaching toward.

A PLACE FOR CELLS TO GROW

Cells do not build tissue in empty space. Left floating, they do little; given a three-dimensional framework to cling to, to crawl through, and gradually to replace with tissue of their own making, they can rebuild. The ideal scaffold is a careful balance of properties. It must be porous, so that cells can infiltrate it and blood vessels can grow in to feed them. It must be biocompatible, so that the body accepts rather than attacks it. And, most subtly, it must be biodegradable at just the right pace — dissolving away as the new tissue takes its place, so that in the end nothing foreign remains, only the repair.

Two of this chapter's patents provide precisely such scaffolds, built from the body's own kinds of material. Tissue Engineering Consultants' "biopolymer foams" (US 5,891,558) are sponge-like structures made from natural biological polymers — materials such as collagen, the very protein that already forms much of the body's scaffolding — engineered into a porous foam that cells can colonise and use to rebuild tissue. ProChon Biotech's "plasma protein matrices" (US 7,009,039) take proteins drawn from blood plasma and form them into a freeze-dried matrix that supports cell growth for repair and regeneration. Different recipes, drawn from different

natural materials, but the same essential purpose: to offer cells a friendly, temporary home in which the body can grow its own replacement.

A GLUE THAT STICKS TO LIVING THINGS

The third patent solves a humbler but genuinely essential problem: how to make a gel or a sealant stick to living tissue at all. This is far harder than it sounds. The surfaces inside the body are wet, constantly renewing themselves, and in motion — precisely the conditions under which ordinary adhesives fail. Focal's patent (US 5,749,968) addresses this with a priming step: pre-treating the tissue surface with an initiator so that a gel applied afterwards will bond and adhere to it far more strongly than it otherwise could. Surgical sealants built on this principle can close leaks, cover raw surfaces, and hold tissues together in places and situations where conventional stitches are impractical or would do more harm than good — and getting them to adhere reliably to living tissue is the whole difference between a sealant that works and one that peels away.

AND THEN THE FENCES CAME DOWN

All three of these patents have now expired. The scaffolds and the sealants of early regenerative medicine — the collagen foams, the plasma-protein matrices, the tissue-adhering gels — have passed into the public domain, free for anyone to make and to build upon.

There is something fitting in ending the book here. Regenerative medicine is the field that most fully expresses medicine's ultimate ambition: not merely to remove disease, and not merely to replace a broken part with a machine, but to help the body rebuild itself, whole and living. Its foundational materials, developed and patented through the 1990s and 2000s, are now common property — a shared box of building blocks laid out for everyone working toward the day when a lost tissue can simply be regrown.

And that is the thread running through all sixteen chapters of this book. Each of these inventions was, in its own time, a guarded secret and a private fortune: the robot's wristed hands, the gene chip, the humanized antibody, the sensor beneath the skin, the scaffold for new tissue. Each was fenced off for twenty years — the price we agreed to pay to make the risk of invention worth taking, and to have the knowledge published in full rather than hidden away. And each, on its own quiet and unannounced morning, has had its fence taken down. The knowledge that changed the world was never meant to stay owned forever. It was always, in the end, meant for us.

A NOTE ON THE METHOD

The sixteen patents in this book were not chosen by opinion or affection. They were drawn from a large database of expired patents and ranked by the number of times later inventions have cited them — a rough but honest measure of how heavily the world came to build on each idea. From the top of that ranking I removed the near-duplicate clusters, so that each chapter tells the story of a distinct breakthrough rather than one company's thicket of overlapping paperwork, and among what remained I chose the inventions that had both a high impact and a story worth telling to a general reader.

Every patent number, assignee, grant year, citation count, and expiry date in these pages is real and drawn from the public patent record, and every one of them can be looked up and read in full by anyone, for free. The scientific and historical explanations are written for the

curious non-specialist and reflect the author's best understanding at the time of writing; where I have simplified, I have tried to do so honestly, but for any serious purpose the patents themselves — and the primary scientific literature — are the authorities, not this book. Nothing here is medical advice, and nothing here should be used to guide any treatment.

The deeper claim of the book is a simple one, and it is worth stating plainly. The patent system is not a wall but a gate with a timer set upon it. Everything held behind it is on its way, by design, to becoming ours. This volume has been one attempt to notice that passage as it happens — to stand, just for a while, on the far side of a handful of the inventions we use without a thought, and to watch each fence, in its turn, come quietly down.