

hello from a reporter

I

Apr 1 (3 days ago)

to David_Sinclair, j.tilly

Dr. Sinclair, Dr. Tilly:

I am writing because I am completing a story on OvaScience, which you both co-founded and whose research--especially Dr. Tilly's--is the scientific framework of the company.

While I have sought comment from the company on corporate matters, there are some scientific questions best posed to you. Please note that all responses are on the record, will be broadly excerpted within the body of the story and the full response, including questions posed, will be directly linked to. (Email/phone address will be removed for privacy sake.)

1. There has been no shortage of debate over Dr. Tilly's 04 Nature and 05 Cell articles. Based on an 06 Nature editorial, the Wagers/Eggan response is considered the most weighty. A just retired researcher, John Eppig, says that a paper he did with MIT researcher David Page on STRA-8 is also problematic for that thesis.

(I do note that Wagers/Eggan did not precisely replicate Tilly's study and that another academic found that the mice oocytes did not decline in number, but remained constant.)

Can you comment on issues of (non)replicability? What, if any, research from you or others has materially advanced the work that is now ~10 yrs old?

Both Gosden and Eppig insist that nothing has advanced the original thesis. What do you say to this?

Dr. Eppig also said of the broad thrust of Tilly's thesis: Why do women go into menopause at all if there are these stem cells present? Do you wish to comment on this?

2. What do you both say of OvaScience's not pursuing a formal study despite having \$60 million in the bank?

3. Do you have an opinion about the presentation/depiction of results from Toronto that was just press-released?

4. When Michelle Dipp said in a recent Science magazine article that "The fertility industry just doesn't do trials", does this represent your experiences? Do you both agree with this view?

5. Dr. Sinclair's work formed the scientific framework for Sirtris Pharmaceutical. It would be broadly disputed by researchers at Amgen and Pfizer.

Apart from the '13 Nature article, do you wish to address the Pfizer/Amgen claims? Specifically, do you wish to amplify your comments re: Pfizer's chemists, which appeared to many (myself included) that your objection centered on questioning their ability to perform basic scientific tasks?

6. Do you have a comment on GSK 's actions re Sirtris?

7. Dr. Sinclair appears to have sold the majority of his OvaScience holdings, unlike Dr. Tilly. Could you comment on why?

Thank you,

Roddy Boyd

Hello Roddy,

>

> 5. Dr. Sinclair's work formed the scientific framework for Sirtris Pharmaceutical. It would be broadly disputed by researchers at Amgen and Pfizer.

>

I attach the paper we published in Science in 2013 that helped clarify the issue. The dispute you mention is no longer an issue among scientists. Other have shown SIRT1 and SIRT6 are both activated by small molecules and by other proteins.

The compound SRT1720 that was apparently toxic has been shown by numerous labs to improve health of mice and even to extend mouse lifespan. See the papers attached.

> 6. Do you have a comment on GSK 's actions re Sirtris?

GSK has an international team working to develop sirtuin activators. Their publicly presented data at the Sirtuin Keystone conference at Santa Fe this year included crystal structures with drug bound and data from phase 2 human trials. The head of the work is Dr. Jim Ellis <James.5.ellis@gsk.com>. I would encourage you to speak with him.

>

> 7. Dr. Sinclair appears to have sold the majority of his OvaScience holdings, unlike Dr. Tilly. Could you comment on why?

>

>

That is completely false.

4 Attachments

Preview attachment ScienceHubbardSinclair2013.pdf
[PDF]

Preview attachment DeCaboSRT1720CellReports.pdf
[PDF]

Preview attachment Minor-SRT1720 manuscript.pdf
[PDF]

Preview attachment deCaboSRT2104_proofs.pdf

