

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register

Vol. 79, No. 32

Tuesday, February 18, 2014

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 882

[Docket No. FDA-2013-M-0042]

Medical Devices; Neurological Devices; Classification of the Neuropsychiatric Interpretive Electroencephalograph Assessment Aid

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final order.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is classifying the neuropsychiatric interpretive electroencephalograph (EEG) assessment aid into class II (special controls). The Agency is classifying the device into class II (special controls) in order to provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness of the device.

DATES: This order is effective March 20, 2014. The classification was applicable beginning July 15, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Como, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 66, Rm. 2463, Silver Spring, MD 20993-0002, 301-796-6919.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In accordance with section 513(f)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the FD&C Act) (21 U.S.C. 360c(f)(1)), devices that were not in commercial distribution before May 28, 1976 (the date of enactment of the Medical Device Amendments of 1976), generally referred to as postamendments devices, are classified automatically by statute into class III without any FDA rulemaking process. These devices

remain in class III and require premarket approval, unless and until the device is classified or reclassified into class I or II, or FDA issues an order finding the device to be substantially equivalent, in accordance with section 513(i) of the FD&C Act, to a predicate device that does not require premarket approval. The Agency determines whether new devices are substantially equivalent to predicate devices by means of premarket notification procedures in section 510(k) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360(k)) and part 807 (21 CFR part 807) of the regulations.

Section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act, as amended by section 607 of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (Pub. L. 112-144, July 9, 2012, 126 Statute 1054), provides two procedures by which a person may request that FDA classify a device under the criteria set forth in section 513(a)(1). Under the first procedure, the person submits a premarket notification under section 510(k) of the FD&C Act for a device that has not previously been classified and, within 30 days of receiving an order classifying the device into class III under section 513(f)(1) of the FD&C Act, the person requests a classification under section 513(f)(2). Under the second procedure, rather than first submitting a premarket notification under section 510(k) and then a request for classification under the first procedure, the person determines that there is no legally marketed device upon which to base a determination of substantial equivalence and requests a classification under section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act. If the person submits a request to classify the device under this second procedure, FDA may decline to undertake the classification request if FDA identifies a legally marketed device that could provide a reasonable basis for review of substantial equivalence with the device or if FDA determines that the device submitted is not of "low-moderate risk" or that general controls would be inadequate to control the risks and special controls to mitigate the risks cannot be developed.

In response to a request to classify a device under either procedure provided by section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act, FDA will classify the device by written order within 120 days. This classification will be the initial classification of the device. Within 30 days after the issuance of an order

classifying the device, FDA must publish a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing this classification.

In accordance with section 513(f)(1) of the FD&C Act, FDA issued an order on November 18, 2011, classifying the Neuropsychiatric EEG-Based Assessment Aid (NEBA) System for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder into class III, because it was not substantially equivalent to a device that was introduced or delivered for introduction into interstate commerce for commercial distribution before May 28, 1976, or a device which was subsequently reclassified into class I or class II. On December 8, 2011, Lexicor Medical Technology, LLC, submitted a request for classification of the NEBA System under section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act. The manufacturer recommended that the device be classified into class II (Ref. 1).

In accordance with section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act, FDA reviewed the request in order to classify the device under the criteria for classification set forth in section 513(a)(1) of the FD&C Act. FDA classifies devices into class II if general controls by themselves are insufficient to provide reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness, but there is sufficient information to establish special controls to provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device for its intended use. After review of the information submitted in the de novo request, FDA determined that the device can be classified into class II with the establishment of special controls. FDA believes these special controls, in addition to general controls, will provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device.

Therefore, on July 15, 2013, FDA issued an order to the requester classifying the device into class II. FDA is codifying the classification of the device by adding 21 CFR 882.1140 (§ 882.1440).

Following the effective date of this final classification administrative order, any firm submitting a 510(k) premarket notification for a neuropsychiatric interpretive EEG assessment aid will need to comply with the special controls named in the final administrative order.

The device is assigned the generic name neuropsychiatric interpretive electroencephalograph assessment aid,

and it is identified as a prescription device that uses a patient's EEG to provide an interpretation of the patient's neuropsychiatric condition. The neuropsychiatric interpretive EEG

assessment aid is used only as an assessment aid for a medical condition for which there exists other valid methods of diagnosis.

FDA has identified the following risks to health associated with this type of device and the measures required to mitigate these risks:

TABLE 1—NEUROPSYCHIATRIC INTERPRETIVE EEG ASSESSMENT AID RISKS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Identified risks	Mitigation measures
Adverse tissue reaction	Biocompatibility.
Electromagnetic incompatibility	Electromagnetic compatibility testing.
Equipment malfunction leading to injury to user/patient (shock, burn, or mechanical failure).	Electrical safety, thermal, and mechanical testing.
False result leading to delay in treatment or unnecessary treatment due to hardware failure.	Labeling.
	Performance testing.
	Hardware and software verification, validation, and hazard analysis.
	Technical parameters.
	Labeling.
False result due to incorrect artifact reduction	Operator training.
	Software verification and validation.
	Labeling.
False result due to incorrect placement of electrodes	Operator training.
	Clinical performance testing.
	Labeling.
False result when a neuropsychiatric interpretive EEG assessment aid is used for confirmatory support or support for further testing.	Clinical performance testing.
	Device design characteristics.
	Labeling.
Use error	Clinical performance testing.
	Labeling.

FDA believes that the following special controls, in addition to the general controls, address these risks to health and provide reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness:

1. The technical parameters of the device, hardware and software, must be fully characterized and must demonstrate a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness.

a. Hardware specifications must be provided. Appropriate verification, validation, and hazard analysis must be performed.

b. Software, including any proprietary algorithm(s) used by the device to arrive at its interpretation of the patient's condition, must be described in detail in the software requirements specification and software design specification. Appropriate software verification, validation, and hazard analysis must be performed.

2. The device parts that contact the patient must be demonstrated to be biocompatible.

3. The device must be designed and tested for electrical safety, electromagnetic compatibility, thermal, and mechanical safety.

4. Clinical performance testing must demonstrate the accuracy, precision, reproducibility, of determining the EEG-based interpretation, including any specified equivocal zones (cutoffs).

5. Clinical performance testing must demonstrate the ability of the device to function as an assessment aid for the medical condition for which the device is indicated. Performance measures

must demonstrate device performance characteristics per the intended use in the intended use environment. Performance measurements must include sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value per the device intended use. Repeatability of measurements must be demonstrated using interclass correlation coefficients and illustrated by qualitative scatter plot(s).

6. The device design must include safeguards to prevent use of the device as a stand-alone diagnostic.

7. The labeling must include the following information:

a. A warning that the device is not to be used as a stand-alone diagnostic.

b. A detailed summary of the clinical performance testing, including any adverse events and complications.

c. The qualifications and training requirements for device users including technicians and clinicians.

d. The intended use population and the intended use environment.

e. Any instructions technicians should convey to patients regarding the collection of EEG data.

f. Information allowing clinicians to gauge clinical risk associated with integrating the EEG interpretive assessment aid into their diagnostic pathway.

g. Where appropriate, validated methods and instructions for reprocessing of any reusable components.

Neuropsychiatric interpretive EEG assessment aids are prescription devices

restricted to patient use only upon the authorization of a practitioner licensed by law to administer or use the device. (Proposed § 882.1440(a); see section 520(e) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360j(e)) and § 801.109 (21 CFR 801.109) (Prescription devices).) Prescription-use restrictions are a type of general controls as defined in section 513(a)(1)(A)(i) of the FD&C Act.

Section 510(m) of the FD&C Act provides that FDA may exempt a class II device from the premarket notification requirements under section 510(k) of the FD&C Act if FDA determines that premarket notification is not necessary to provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device. For this type of device, FDA has determined that premarket notification is necessary to provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device. Therefore, this device type is not exempt from premarket notification requirements. Persons who intend to market this type of device must submit to FDA a premarket notification prior to marketing the device, which contains information about the neuropsychiatric interpretive EEG assessment aid they intend to market.

II. Environmental Impact

The Agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.34(b) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore,

neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

III. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This final administrative order establishes special controls that refer to previously approved collections of information found in other FDA regulations. These collections of information are subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520). The collections of information in part 807, subpart E, regarding premarket notification submissions have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0120, and the collections of information in 21 CFR part 801, regarding labeling, have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0485.

IV. Reference

The following reference has been placed on display in the Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852, and may be seen by interested persons between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, and is available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

1. K112711—De Novo Request per 513(f) pursuant to the Agency's NSE Determination, dated November 18, 2011, From Lexicor Medical Technology, LLC, dated December 7, 2011.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 882

Medical devices, Neurological devices.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, 21 CFR part 882 is amended as follows:

PART 882—NEUROLOGICAL DEVICES

- 1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 882 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 351, 360, 360c, 360e, 360j, 371.

- 2. Add § 882.1440 to subpart B to read as follows:

§ 882.1440 Neuropsychiatric interpretive electroencephalograph assessment aid.

(a) *Identification.* The neuropsychiatric interpretive electroencephalograph assessment aid is a prescription device that uses a patient's electroencephalograph (EEG) to provide an interpretation of the patient's neuropsychiatric condition. The neuropsychiatric interpretive EEG

assessment aid is used only as an assessment aid for a medical condition for which there exists other valid methods of diagnosis.

(b) *Classification.* Class II (special controls). The special controls for this device are:

(1) The technical parameters of the device, hardware and software, must be fully characterized and must demonstrate a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness.

(i) Hardware specifications must be provided. Appropriate verification, validation, and hazard analysis must be performed.

(ii) Software, including any proprietary algorithm(s) used by the device to arrive at its interpretation of the patient's condition, must be described in detail in the software requirements specification and software design specification. Appropriate software verification, validation, and hazard analysis must be performed.

(2) The device parts that contact the patient must be demonstrated to be biocompatible.

(3) The device must be designed and tested for electrical safety, electromagnetic compatibility, thermal, and mechanical safety.

(4) Clinical performance testing must demonstrate the accuracy, precision, reproducibility, of determining the EEG-based interpretation, including any specified equivocal zones (cutoffs).

(5) Clinical performance testing must demonstrate the ability of the device to function as an assessment aid for the medical condition for which the device is indicated. Performance measures must demonstrate device performance characteristics per the intended use in the intended use environment. Performance measurements must include sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value per the device intended use. Repeatability of measurements must be demonstrated using interclass correlation coefficients and illustrated by qualitative scatter plot(s).

(6) The device design must include safeguards to prevent use of the device as a stand-alone diagnostic.

(7) The labeling must include the following information:

(i) A warning that the device is not to be used as a stand-alone diagnostic.

(ii) A detailed summary of the clinical performance testing, including any adverse events and complications.

(iii) The qualifications and training requirements for device users including technicians and clinicians.

(iv) The intended use population and the intended use environment.

(v) Any instructions technicians should convey to patients regarding the collection of EEG data.

(vi) Information allowing clinicians to gauge clinical risk associated with integrating the EEG interpretive assessment aid into their diagnostic pathway.

(vii) Where appropriate, validated methods and instructions for reprocessing of any reusable components.

Dated: February 12, 2014.

Leslie Kux,

Assistant Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2014–03388 Filed 2–14–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[Docket No. USCG–2013–1067]

Special Local Regulation; Southern California Annual Marine Events for the San Diego Captain of the Port Zone

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of enforcement of regulation.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard will enforce the special local regulations in 33 CFR 100.1101 during the California Half Ironman Triathlon, held on March 29, 2014. This event occurs in Oceanside Harbor, Oceanside, CA. These special local regulations are necessary to provide for the safety of the participants, crew, spectators, sponsor vessels of the triathlon, and general users of the waterway. During the enforcement period, persons and vessels are prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within this regulated area unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective from 6:40 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. on March 29, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this notice, call or email Petty Officer Bryan Gollo, Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Diego, CA; telephone (619) 278–7656, email D11-PF-MarineEventsSanDiego@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Coast Guard will enforce the special local regulations in 33 CFR 100.1101 in support of the annual marine event, the California Half Ironman Triathlon (Item 2 on Table 1 of 33 CFR 100.1101), held