What Are the Reporting Requirements for AI Device Malfunctions?

Rasit Dinc

Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research

Published: June 25, 2021 | FDA Regulation and Compliance

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17998621

Abstract

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into medical devices has ushered in a new era of healthcare, promising more accurate diagnoses, personalized ...

What Are the Reporting Requirements for AI Device Malfunctions?

By Rasit Dinc

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into medical devices has ushered in a new era of healthcare, promising more accurate diagnoses, personalized treatments, and improved patient outcomes. From AI-powered imaging analysis to sophisticated clinical decision support systems, these technologies are rapidly becoming indispensable tools for health professionals. However, with great innovation comes great responsibility. The unique nature of AI algorithms, with their ability to learn and evolve, presents new challenges for ensuring patient safety. A critical aspect of this is the robust reporting of device malfunctions. This article provides an overview of the current reporting requirements for AI device malfunctions, drawing on existing regulations and recent academic research.

At present, AI-enabled medical devices are primarily governed by the same regulations as traditional medical devices. In the United States, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has established the legal framework for medical device reporting under 21 CFR Part 803. This regulation mandates that manufacturers, importers, and device user facilities report certain adverse events to the FDA. For AI devices, the definition of a “malfunction” is particularly pertinent. A malfunction is defined as the failure of a device to meet its performance specifications or otherwise perform as intended [2]. This is a broad definition that encompasses not only complete failures but also any deviation from the expected performance, a crucial consideration for AI systems where performance can be nuanced and context-dependent.

The regulation further clarifies that a report is required when a device “caused or contributed” to a death or serious injury. This means that even if

the device was only one of several factors, a report may still be necessary. This is a critical point for AI devices, where the causal chain of an adverse event can be complex and difficult to unravel. The so-called “black box” nature of some AI algorithms can make it challenging to pinpoint the exact cause of a malfunction, but the regulation makes it clear that a reasonable suspicion is enough to trigger a reporting requirement.

Despite the existence of this regulatory framework, there are significant challenges in applying it to AI devices. A recent systematic review protocol highlighted the suboptimal state of adverse event reporting for medical devices in general, citing a lack of awareness and a culture of non-reporting as major contributing factors [1]. The introduction of AI exacerbates these challenges. The unique failure modes of AI, such as algorithmic bias, data drift, and unexpected outputs, are not always well understood by clinicians, making it difficult to recognize and report them as device malfunctions.

Furthermore, the current reporting systems are not specifically designed to capture the nuances of AI-related adverse events. The lack of standardized terminology and reporting formats for AI malfunctions makes it difficult to aggregate and analyze data, hindering the ability of regulators and manufacturers to identify emerging safety signals. The aforementioned systematic review protocol emphasizes the urgent need to understand the limitations of current adverse event reporting systems and to develop new mechanisms for detecting, attributing, and reporting AI-related events [1].

So, what does this mean for health professionals on the front lines? It is crucial to be aware of the reporting requirements and to foster a culture of transparency and vigilance. Any suspected malfunction of an AI-enabled medical device, particularly if it has the potential to cause harm, should be reported through the appropriate channels within your institution. This includes not only obvious errors but also subtle performance degradations or unexpected behaviors. By diligently reporting these events, you are not only protecting your patients but also contributing to the collective knowledge base that is essential for improving the safety and effectiveness of these transformative technologies.

In conclusion, while the current regulatory framework for medical device reporting provides a foundation for overseeing AI-enabled devices, it is clear that more specific guidance and improved reporting mechanisms are needed. As AI continues to transform the landscape of healthcare, a collaborative effort between regulators, manufacturers, and health professionals will be essential to ensure that these powerful tools are used safely and effectively for the benefit of all patients.

© 2021 Rasit Dinc