Financial interests and evidence in public comments on the FDA framework for modifications to artificial intelligence/machine learning-based medical devices

James A. Smith[1,2,*], Roxanna E. Abhari[1], Zain U. Hussain[3], Carl Henegan[4], Gary S. Collins[2,5], Andrew J. Carr[1,2]

1. Botnar Research Centre, Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, UK
2. National Institute for Health Research Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK
3. College of Medicine and Veterinary Sciences, University of Edinburgh, UK
4. Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK
5. Centre for Statistics in Medicine, Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

*Author for correspondence: James A. Smith; james.smith2@ndorms.ox.ac.uk; Botnar Research Centre, Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, OX3 7LD, UK.

Abstract

The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has proposed a regulatory framework for modifications to artificial intelligence/machine learning-based software as a medical device (SaMD). We analysed the 125 non-duplicate and non-spam public comments on the proposed framework and found that industry and other parties with a potential financial interest contributed a minimum of 63% of comments and that the absence of a conflict of interest could be confirmed in only 8%. Despite the FDA's stated commitment to using scientific evidence in the rule-making process, the vast majority of submitted comments (86%) did not cite any scientific literature, just 4% cited a systematic review or meta-analysis, and no comments indicated whether a systematic process was used to identify relevant literature. We recommend that the FDA requires disclosure of conflicts of interest in comments in the future. As the framework continues to be modified, engagement from non-conflicted parties and better use of scientific evidence may help to ensure the development of a regulatory system that best promotes patient interests.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence and machine learning (AI/ML) are increasingly prevalent in the healthcare literature[1]. Several medical devices incorporating AI/ML have now been approved by the US FDA, including an autonomous diagnostic system that does not require input from a clinician for interpretation[2]. Because artificial intelligence may learn and adapt to additional data in real time to improve performance, regulators have questioned the suitability of traditional medical device regulatory pathways for AI/ML containing devices.

Changes that might affect a device's performance under the current regulatory framework would require further review from the FDA, which is time-consuming and may not suit the iterative modification that often characterises software development and deployment. The FDA has therefore proposed a regulatory framework for modifications to AI/ML-based SaMD[3] (Box 1). Because the FDA is one of the most prominent regulatory agencies, other agencies are likely to follow FDA frameworks. It is therefore essential that the framework reflects and promotes patient interests and safety.

Box 1: Summary of AI/ML framework: "Proposed Regulatory Framework for Modifications to Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML)-Based Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) - Discussion Paper and Request for Feedback"[3]

"The FDA released the first discussion paper on April 2nd 2019 outlining a framework for regulating modifications to SaMD that use Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML). The comment period closed on June 3rd 2019. The proposed framework describes:

- The extent to which FDA's traditional framework for assessing modifications to devices should apply to AI/ML SaMD
- Modification categories for continuously learning AI/ML SaMD and a proposed "pre-determined change control plan" in pre-market submissions: when seeking regulatory approval, manufacturers would also submit a plan for modifications, including model retraining, as part of the initial pre-market review.
- Expectations for manufacturers to monitor the real-world performance of AI/ML systems and periodically report updates to users and to the FDA on what changes have been implemented.

- The evaluation, monitoring, and management of risks from AI/ML modifications from initial pre-market submission through to post-market performance.
- Hypothetical examples of modifications and their applicability to the proposed framework."

The development of FDA regulations and guidance is intended to be transparent and involves opportunities for the public to assess and comment on proposed rules before they are finalised. Comments can be submitted by anyone and are considered by the FDA in subsequent drafts and final rulings. However, there is significant potential for conflicts of interest (COI) among commenters, who could serve to benefit financially from particular outcomes, such as lower regulatory scrutiny.

Therefore, we evaluated the prevalence of financial COI in comments on the recent proposed AI/ML device framework. There is a huge academic literature available related to AI/ML, which could be used to inform the development of new regulations, and the FDA explicitly look for 'good science' in submitted comments[4]. We also, therefore, examined the citation of scientific evidence, including of systematic reviews, to determine whether there is opportunity to increase and improve its use in comments.

Results

130 public comments were submitted in response to the proposed regulatory framework at the time we downloaded data (8th August 2019), of which 5 were duplicates, near-duplicates, or spam, leaving 125 comments for analysis. Combining industry, mixed associations (which include representatives of industry) and other contributors with

identified COI revealed that at least 79 (63%) comments came from parties with potential COI (Table 1). For 36 comments, (29%) it was not clear, and the absence of a conflict could be confirmed in only 10 comments (8%). The length of comments and proportion of comments citing scientific evidence was similar across submitters regardless of financial interest (Table 1).

Table 2 summarises the categories of organisations or individuals submitting comments. Industry submitted 64 (51%) comments. Of the 61 non-industry comments, we were able to determine whether or not a COI was present in 25 submissions (41%). Of these 25, conflicts for 15 were identified, and no conflicts were found for 10. No conflicts were disclosed in any of the non-industry comments.

Of the 125 comments, 108 (86%) did not cite scientific literature, 15 (12%) cited at least one paper published in an academic journal, and two (1.6%) cited article pre-prints but not papers in academic journals. Five (4.6%) comments cited a systematic review or meta-analysis, and none of the 125 comments reported any systematic method for identifying the literature referenced in the document.

Discussion

Financial Conflicts of Interest

Industry and other submitters with COI comprised nearly two thirds of the comments on the proposed FDA framework. We found no evidence that submitters without a financial interest were more likely to cite scientific evidence or contribute more comprehensive comments.

COI may influence policy. An analysis of comments on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC's) 2016 guideline for prescribing opioids for chronic pain revealed that 29% of submitting organisations had received funding from opioid manufacturers[5]. These organisations, as well as organisations that had received funding from other life science companies or whose funding source was not known, were significantly less supportive of the guidelines than organisations with no funding from industry. Proposed changes to the European medical device framework in 2008 included more rigorous testing and centralised regulation by the European Medicines Agency (EMA). Of the 200 responses received, 117 were from industry and were largely against the involvement of the EMA, in contrast to the support from doctors, academics, patients and consumers[6]. EMA involvement was subsequently decided against. COI can also influence the reporting of results of clinical research[7,8].

Identifying conflicts was not straightforward. For anonymous commenters, or those that provide a name but no organisation, it is impossible to identify potential conflicts. The regulations.gov 'Tips for submitting effective comments' document does not mention disclosure of COI[9], nor does the FDA's information page on submitting comments[4]. Although disclosure will not necessarily change the interpretation of information, it is an important first step in improving transparency. We recommend that the FDA requests a statement of COI in comments, which would help to further determine the extent of COI in future public consultations. They could also reject anonymous comments unless there is a clear reason that anonymity would improve comment quality.

Scientific Evidence and Academic Engagement

Despite the FDA[4] and federal government[9] iterating that their decisions are based on science (as well as law and reason), scientific evidence of any sort was not cited across the vast majority of comments. The number of academics submitting responses was also low, in contrast to the vast and growing amount of published academic research on AI/ML in healthcare (reviewed in [1]). However, it is possible to support almost any argument by cherry-picking the literature. Systematic reviews somewhat overcome this problem by increasing the objectivity of assessment of literature to answer a particular question[10,11]; however, only five of 125 comments cited a systematic review. There are very few systematic reviews available in this field, and systematic reviews, or indeed any research literature, may not, therefore, be available for all aspects of proposed regulations. In such cases, systematic searches could have been performed; however, such searches was not reported in any submitted comments.

Regardless, an increase in the number of reasoned and logical comments from (preferably non-conflicted) academic researchers would be worthwhile. Financial interests will tend to pull in a uniform direction and a lack of scientific evidence will not prevent this bias from manifesting. Though there will still be bias in opinions expressed for other non-financial reasons (such as personal experiences or political or intellectual beliefs), it will tend to be multi-directional and therefore less problematic.

In other areas of medical device regulation, there is literature available evaluating or critiquing regulatory frameworks[12–14]. Such work is valuable, but once regulations have been developed it is a laborious process for them to be changed. AI/ML regulation is in an early

stage where the research literature could be used prospectively to help to define the best course of action and reduce the probability of issues occurring in the future.

We encourage greater participation by academics in this and other regulatory development. Participation should come both from experts in the technology in question, as well as from the broader medical community that will use and evaluate it. Continued input from associations and the greater use of scientific evidence, in particular that from systematic reviews, by all commenters, could be valuable.

Limitations

First, because of the early stage of and diversity of topics in the proposed regulatory framework, we could not categorise it as either pro- industry or not, which in turn made assessing the extent of agreement of commenters with the proposed framework meaningless. This is in contrast to other work like that discussed above, which was able to quantify the directionality of opinion and its association with conflicts[5,6]. In our discussion, we have therefore assumed that industry interests will tend to be overrepresented in comments that are submitted by parties with a financial COI.

Second, we have access only to the information externally submitted to FDA by the public, and undoubtedly further evidence is considered internally. However, the purpose of public consultations is to gather information from the public to inform regulation. It is important to have high quality, reasoned, objective and transparent information so that a positive impact on internal decision making can be expected.

Conclusion

We found that the prevalence of financial COI in commenters was high. For a large number of comments, we were unable to determine whether or not a conflict was present, and disclosure of COI was non-existent. The proportion of academic submitters was relatively low, and the use of scientific evidence to support comments was sparse. These findings paint a relatively bleak picture and the process to change FDA policy, for example regarding policies on COI disclosure, is likely to be slow.

There is, however, a significant opportunity for researchers working in AI/ML in healthcare to have an immediate impact on the development of rules that are based on scientific evidence and that prioritise patient benefit. The regulations.gov guidance on commenting states: "Although public support or opposition may help guide important public policies, agencies make determinations for a proposed action based on sound reasoning and scientific evidence rather than a majority of votes. A single, well-supported comment may carry more weight than a thousand form letters"[9]. The development of the AI/ML framework is still in its early stages, and there is, therefore, still a high likelihood of being able to contribute to and influence it[15]. If readers of this article provide high quality comments in future developments of the proposed rules, supported by sound scientific evidence, they may well be weighted more highly in decision making than other comments and directly impact the framework under development. The FDA should encourage disclosure of conflicts, and in the absence of a requirement submitters should disclose proactively. Our recommendations are also relevant to public consultations for other areas of regulation.

Author Contributions

JAS conceived the study, conducted a pilot study, analysed the data in R and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. REA extracted data from public comments and contributed to the first draft. ZUH extracted data from public comments and repeated the data analysis independently in Python. All authors interpreted the data, reviewed and critically appraised the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Competing Interests

JAS is part of the Carr Group at the University of Oxford, which is developing medical devices. He receives funding from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Oxford Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). REA was also part of the Carr Group while the majority of this research was conducted. CH receives funding support from the NIHR School for Primary Care Research Evidence Synthesis Working group (NIHR SPCR ESWG project 390) and the NIHR Oxford BRC. He is an NIHR senior investigator, editor in chief of BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine, and an NHS urgent care GP and has received payments for his media work (full declaration at www.phc.ox.ac.uk/team/carl-heneghan). GSC receives funding support from the NIHR Oxford BRC, Cancer Research UK (programme grant C49297/A27294) and the Medical Research Council (MR/S036741/1). AJC is currently developing medical devices with funding from NIHR I4I and the Wellcome Trust. He has received unrelated consultancy fees from Novartis and is a member of the Medical Research Council (MRC) Developmental Pathway Funding Scheme (DPFS) panel. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health.

Methods

The docket folder for comment submission for the "Proposed Regulatory Framework for Modifications to Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML)-Based Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) - Discussion Paper and Request for Feedback" [16] was accessed 8th August 2019 and meta-data for all comments exported to Microsoft Excel. Any comments submitted after this date, which was after the comment period closed, were not included in analysis. Individual comments were subsequently accessed via the docket by following the link in the Excel export. We conducted a pilot study in which JAS developed a data extraction protocol by reading and preliminarily analysing all comments submitted on the proposed framework. Two reviewers (REA and ZUH) then independently extracted data from all comments according to the extraction protocol (available on Open Science Framework: https://osf.io/g423d/). We accessed the data from August to October 2019 and the comment order was randomised for each reviewer. JAS consolidated any discrepancies between the reviewers. Some minor changes were made to the data extraction procedure during the consolidation process; these are described in the extraction protocol. JAS extracted and checked any new data as required.

We recorded a category for each organisation or individual submitting a comment (e.g. industry, association, academia, etc), whether a conflict of interest (COI) could be identified, and, if so, whether it was disclosed. A conflict of interest was defined as occurring when an organisation or individual had financial interests that could be impacted by the proposed regulatory framework.

We determined COI for academic contributors by identifying web pages that highlighted a link with industry (for example an advisory board position) and examining COI disclosures or receipt of grant funding from industry in recent publications (published in the last two years). For healthcare professionals and individual consumers, we also searched the open payments database (https://openpaymentsdata.cms.gov/) for payments from industry. For associations, we determined the presence of COI based on the self-identification of the association (e.g. we are a trade association), the members of the association (whether any of the member organisations were from industry), and the presence of COI amongst authors of comments representing the association, in the same way as done for academics. If there were no listed authors on the comment, we also looked at the board members and considered the organisation to have a financial interest if greater than half of the members had a COI. Industry submitters were considered to have a COI. Where we could identify a specific statement that academic submitters did not have COI in a publication in the last two years, we recorded that there was no COI. When no conflict could be identified for an association, we assumed that there was no conflict. We assumed that submitters from the federal government did not have a COI. When the presence or absence of a conflict could not be determined according to these criteria, it was recorded as unknown.

For industry submitters, we assumed that COI disclosure would not be required because the COI is self-evident, but that for any other conflicted submitters a disclosure would be required for the FDA to be aware of the COI. Therefore, for non-industry submissions with COIs, we recorded whether or not the COI was disclosed.

As a proxy for the use of scientific evidence in comments, we recorded whether comments cited articles published in academic journals, pre-prints (which included conference proceedings), systematic reviews or meta-analyses, and whether any systematic search was reported to identify any documents or literature. We also recorded the length of each comment to give an indication of its comprehensiveness.

Analysis was descriptive and was conducted in R v3.6.1 [ref: [17]]. The R code and dataset are provided on Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/g423d/). The analysis was reproduced in Python independently.

References

1. Topol, E. J. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nat. Med.* **25**, 44–56 (2019).
2. He, J. *et al.* The practical implementation of artificial intelligence technologies in medicine. *Nat. Med.* **25**, 30–36 (2019).
3. FDA. Proposed Regulatory Framework for Modifications to Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML)-Based Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) - Discussion Paper and Request for Feedback. (2019).
4. Office of the Commissioner. Comment on Proposed Regulations and Submit Petitions. *FDA* http://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/dockets-management/comment-proposed-regulations-and-submit-petitions (2019).
5. Lin, D. H., Lucas, E., Murimi, I. B., Kolodny, A. & Alexander, G. C. Financial Conflicts of Interest and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's 2016 Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain. *JAMA Intern. Med.* **177**, 427–428 (2017).

6. Bowers, S. & Cohen, D. How lobbying blocked European safety checks for dangerous medical implants. *BMJ* **363**, k4999 (2018).
7. Bekelman, J. E., Li, Y. & Gross, C. P. Scope and Impact of Financial Conflicts of Interest in Biomedical Research: A Systematic Review. *JAMA* **289**, 454–465 (2003).
8. Lundh, A., Lexchin, J., Mintzes, B., Schroll, J. B. & Bero, L. Industry sponsorship and research outcome. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **2**, MR000033 (2017).
9. Regulations.gov. Tips for submitting effective comments.
10. Greenhalgh, T. How to read a paper: Papers that summarise other papers (systematic reviews and meta-analyses). *BMJ* **315**, 672–675 (1997).
11. Mulrow, C. D. Systematic Reviews: Rationale for systematic reviews. *BMJ* **309**, 597–599 (1994).
12. Zargar, N. & Carr, A. The regulatory ancestral network of surgical meshes. *PLoS ONE* **13**, (2018).
13. Medical Devices and the Public's Health: The FDA 510(k) Clearance Process at 35 Years. *Institute of Medicine* http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2011/Medical-Devices-and-the-Publics-Health-The-FDA-510k-Clearance-Process-at-35-Years.aspx.
14. Lenzer, J. & Reporters, I. Medical device industry: international investigation exposes lax regulation. *BMJ* **363**, k4997 (2018).
15. Safford, H. & Brown, A. Communicating science to policymakers: six strategies for success. *Nature* **572**, 681–682 (2019).
16. Regulations.gov - Docket Folder Summary. https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=FDA-2019-N-1185.
17. R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing*. (2019).

Tables

TABLE 1: PRESENCE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS, CITATION OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE, AND DOCUMENT LENGTH

Financial interest	% of total (n)	% citing scientific evidence (n)[1]	Median document length, pages (range)
Yes[2]	63.2% (79)	16.5% (13)	4 (1-30)
No	8% (10)	10% (1)	2.5 (1-13)
Unknown	28.8% (36)	8.3% (3)	1 (1-7)

[1]Including articles in journals or preprints

[2]Includes industry, industry associations, mixed associations, and any other submitters for which we were able to identify a COI

TABLE 2: CATEGORY OF ORGANISATION OR INDIVIDUAL SUBMITTING COMMENT, CITATION OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE, AND DOCUMENT LENGTH

Category	**% of total (n)**	**% citing scientific evidence (n)[1]**	**Median document length, pages (range)**
Industry[2]	51.2% (64)	12.5% (8)	4 (1-30)
Academia	17.6% (22)	9.1% (2)	1 (1-13)
Healthcare[3]	9.6% (12)	16.7% (2)	2.5 (1-8)
Unknown	7.2% (9)	0% (0)	1 (1-6)
Other	5.6% (7)	57.1% (4)	2 (1-5)
Mixed association[4]	4% (5)	20% (1)	5 (4-8)
Individual consumer	3.2% (4)	0% (0)	1 (1)
Federal government	1.6% (2)	0% (0)	1.5 (1-2)

[1]Percentage of that "Category" citing scientific evidence, including articles in journals or preprints

[2]Including industry associations

[3]Healthcare professionals and healthcare associations

[4]Associations comprising industry and non-industry