



**Letter to the Editor of *Barron's*
December 11, 2007**

Dear Editor:

We would like to call your attention to a number of important facts that Mr. Bill Alpert failed to address in his December 7, 2007 article on Kinetic Concepts, Inc. (KCI).

Mr. Alpert's article does not mention the fact that a Federal Court specifically upheld a jury finding that the Wake Forest patents licensed to KCI were both valid and enforceable. This Court did so after the jury considered the Svedman materials mentioned, despite the implications in the article suggesting otherwise. In addition, the concepts disclosed in the Svedman materials, including patents issued to Svedman, were disclosed to the U.S. Patent Office prior to issuance of the Wake Forest patents litigated in the 2006 case.

Moreover, Wake Forest submitted both the Svedman materials and the Tumey deposition given in connection with the 2006 court case to the U.S. Patent Office in a continuation patent application. The U.S. Patent Office subsequently issued a new patent (Patent No. 7,216,651) to Wake Forest in April of 2007.

Responsible reporting and thorough research should have resulted in a more balanced picture of our intellectual property rather than portraying old allegations as new revelations. In the future, we hope that you will be more diligent in verifying publicly-available information to avoid publishing such a clearly one-sided viewpoint.

Sincerely,

/s/ Kristie L. Madara

Kristie L. Madara
Vice President – Corporate Affairs