medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Clinical Evidence Supporting FDA Clearance of First-of-a-Kind Therapeutic Devices via the De Novo Pathway Between 2011 and 2019: A Retrospective Cross-Sectional Analysis

James L. Johnston, BS[1]
Sanket S. Dhruva, MD, MHS [2.3]
Joseph S. Ross, MD, MHS [4.5.6]
Vinay K. Rathi, MD [7.8]

[1] Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT; [2] San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center, San Francisco, CA; [3] Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine, San Francisco, CA; [4] Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation (CORE), Yale-New Haven Hospital, New Haven, CT; [5] Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT; [6] Section of General Internal Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT; [7] Department of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery, Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston, MA; [8] Harvard Business School, Boston, MA

Correspondence to:
Vinay K. Rathi, MD
Department of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery, Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, 243 Charles Street, Boston, MA 02114
Email: vinay_rathi@meei.harvard.edu

Word count: 3208
References: 25
Tables: 5
Figures: 1

Contributors and sources

JLJ is a second-year medical student at Yale University. SSD is an Assistant Professor of Medicine at the University of California, San Francisco. JSR is a Professor of Medicine and Public Health at Yale University. VKR is a fourth-year resident physician in the Harvard combined program in otolaryngology.

VKR and JSR led study conception and design. JLJ contributed to study design and led drafting the manuscript, data acquisition, and analysis. The primary data sources were publicly available FDA documents. SSD, JSR, and VKR are subject matter experts in the regulation of medical devices. SSD and JSR have additionally received grant funding from the FDA and the Medical Devices Innovation Consortium, through the National Evaluation System for Health Technology, to pioneer methods of medical device postmarket surveillance and evaluation. JSR and VKR provided JLJ with supervision. All authors revised the manuscript for critically important content. VKR is the guarantor.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Patient Involvement

No patients were involved in the design or conduct of the study.

Conflicts of Interest/Funding

Mr. Johnston has received support from the FDA through the Yale-Mayo Clinic Center for Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation (CERSI) program. Dr. Dhruva currently receives research support through the National Institute of Health (K12HL138046) and the Greenwall Foundation. He also reports receiving travel support from the Food & Drug Administration and the National Evaluation System for health Technology Coordinating Center (NESTcc). In the past 36 months, Dr. Ross received research support through Yale University from Medtronic, Inc. and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to develop methods for postmarket surveillance of medical devices (U01FD004585), from the Centers of Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to develop and maintain performance measures that are used for public reporting (HHSM-500-2013-13018I), and from the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association to better understand medical technology evaluation; Dr. Ross currently receives research support through Yale University from Johnson and Johnson to develop methods of clinical trial data sharing, from the Food and Drug Administration to establish Yale-Mayo Clinic Center for Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation (CERSI) program (U01FD005938), from the Medical Device Innovation Consortium as part of the National Evaluation System for Health Technology Coordinating Center (NESTcc), from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (R01HS022882), from the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) (R01HS025164, R01HL144644), and from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation to establish the Good Pharma Scorecard at Bioethics International and to establish the Collaboration for Research Integrity and Transparency (CRIT) at Yale.
Dr. Rathi has no conflicts of interest or funding to disclose.

Transparency declaration

The lead author affirms that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

KEY POINTS

What is already known on this topic

- The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) established the De Novo premarket review pathway for first-of-a-kind moderate-risk devices in 1997 in order to reduce barriers to technological innovation and patient access.
- In recent years, manufacturers have increasingly received FDA clearance to market devices through the De Novo pathway.
- The importance of the De Novo pathway will continue to grow as the FDA seeks to expedite patient access relative to international regulators.

What this study adds

- Although the FDA clears the majority of therapeutic De Novo devices based on premarket evidence from pivotal clinical studies, 43% were cleared without such evidence or based on pivotal studies with failed primary effectiveness endpoints.
- The FDA rarely required postmarket studies of therapeutic De Novo devices, which often served as the basis for new models and competitor products subsequently cleared via the 510(k) process.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Objective: The US Food and Drug Administration established the De Novo premarket review pathway for first-of-a-kind moderate-risk devices in 1997 in order to reduce barriers to technological innovation and patient access. We sought to characterize three key features of this pathway: (1) the strength of clinical evidence supporting FDA clearance of therapeutic De Novo devices; (2) FDA post-marketing requirements for these devices; and (3) use of these devices as the basis for devices subsequently cleared via the 510(k) process.

Design: Retrospective cross-sectional analysis

Setting: Publicly available online FDA databases, including the De Novo database, the 510(k) clearance database, the 522 Post Market Surveillance database, and the Recalls of Medical Devices database

Participants: All moderate-risk therapeutic devices cleared via the De Novo pathway between January 1, 2011, and December 31, 2019.

Main Outcome Measures: (1) proportion of De Novo devices cleared based on evidence from a pivotal clinical study, (2) proportion of pivotal study primary effectiveness endpoints that were met, (3) proportion of De Novo devices subject to FDA-required postmarket studies, and (4) proportion of De Novo devices serving as the basis for at least one subsequently cleared 510(k) device (i.e., new models or competitor products).

Results: There were 63 (of 65; 96.9%) moderate-risk therapeutic devices cleared by FDA via the De Novo pathway between 2011 and 2019 for which decision summary documentation was publicly available. Of the 63 devices, 51 (81.0%) were supported by pivotal clinical studies (n=54 studies); the remainder (n=12; 19.0%) were not supported by a pivotal clinical study. The majority of pivotal studies were randomized (57.4%), multi-armed (61.1%), and used an active

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(25.9%) or sham (35.2%) comparator arm; 17 (31.5%) failed to meet at least one primary effectiveness endpoint. Among the 63 devices cleared via the De Novo pathway, one (1.6%) was subject to an FDA-required posttmarket study and 32 (47.8%) served as a predicate device for new models or competitor devices subsequently cleared through the 510(k) process.

Conclusions: Between 2011 and 2019, the FDA cleared the majority of first-of-a-kind moderate-risk therapeutic devices via the De Novo pathway based on premarket evidence from pivotal clinical studies. However, 43% of devices were cleared without clinical evidence from pivotal studies or based on pivotal studies that failed primary effectiveness endpoints. The FDA rarely required postmarket studies of these devices, which often served as the basis for new models and competitor products subsequently cleared via the 510(k) process.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Under the Medical Device Regulation Act of 1976,(1) the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates medical devices using a three-tiered risk classification system: class I (low-risk devices, such as bandages), class II (moderate-risk devices, such as glucometers), and class III devices (high-risk devices, such as prosthetic heart valves). Approximately 90% of devices subject to FDA premarket review are classified as moderate-risk.(2) Moderate-risk devices are primarily regulated through the 510(k) pathway, which requires manufacturers to demonstrate their device is "substantially equivalent" in intended use and technological specifications (with allowable exceptions) to at least one previously FDA-cleared device, known as a "predicate device."(3) Fewer than 10% of 510(k) devices are cleared based on supporting premarket clinical evidence; the safety and effectiveness of these devices is presumed based on the evaluation of the predicate device.

The 510(k) pathway was not designed to regulate first-of-a-kind devices; as a result, the FDA was historically required to automatically designate all novel technologies as high-risk, even for devices that presumably conferred lower levels of risk to patients. These technologies were subject to regulation via the Premarket Approval pathway for high-risk devices, which requires clinical evidence for approval and is therefore the longest and most costly route to market. In an effort to reduce barriers to technological innovation and patient access, US Congress established the De Novo pathway under the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997.(4) The De Novo pathway permits manufacturers to establish and market first-of-a-kind low- or moderate risk devices, which may serve as predicates supporting clearance of subsequent 510(k) devices.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Device manufacturers can apply for device clearance via the De Novo pathway following FDA denial of preceding 510(k) applications due to lack of substantial equivalence or (as of 2012) directly when devices have no potential predicates. De Novo pathway applications require several key components, including the recommended risk-classification for the device, the probable benefits and risks accompanying device use, and non-clinical data such as bench performance testing. If non-clinical studies are deemed insufficient to provide reasonable assurance of device safety and effectiveness, the FDA requires clinical data for clearance.(5)

The De Novo pathway has served as a path to market for a variety of devices, such as the single-lead electrocardiogram feature of the Apple© Watch and treatments (e.g., embolization and high intensity therapeutic ultrasound devices) for benign prostatic hyperplasia.(5) In recent years, manufacturers have increasingly sought to market first-of-a-kind devices via the De Novo pathway. Whereas the FDA cleared 65 devices via the De Novo pathway between 1997 and 2012, the agency cleared 165 devices through this pathway between 2013 and 2018.(6) The FDA anticipates that the importance of the De Novo pathway will continue to grow as the agency seeks to expedite patient access to novel devices relative to international markets.(6)

Given the increasing use of this pathway for novel medical devices, patients, physicians, and policymakers should understand the evidence supporting De Novo clearance. This evidence has important implications for clinical practice, as premarket studies inform both the clinical adoption of De Novo devices as well as subsequent FDA regulation of new models and competitor products, including the need for postmarket surveillance. We therefore sought to systematically characterize the premarket pivotal clinical studies supporting FDA clearance of therapeutic devices cleared via the De Novo Pathway and FDA postmarket experience with these devices.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

METHODS

Device Cohort

We conducted a retrospective cross-sectional analysis of therapeutic devices cleared through the De Novo pathway between January 1, 2011, and December 31, 2019, using the FDA De Novo database (**Figure 1**).(7) We restricted our analysis to devices cleared after 2010 because the FDA began releasing documents summarizing the premarket evidence supporting clearance during this year; devices without publicly available summary documents were excluded from analysis.(8) We chose to focus on therapeutic devices because these technologies are typically evaluated based on clinical safety and effectiveness data rather than concordance with reference standards (as is often the case for diagnostic devices).

Using FDA-designed product codes,(9) we classified each De Novo device as either therapeutic or non-therapeutic (e.g., diagnostic tests or procedural equipment). For each therapeutic device, we determined the clearance year, FDA-designated medical specialty, and whether the manufacturer submitted the marketing application directly via the De Novo pathway or following a denied 510(k) application. We additionally extracted whether the FDA classified the device as implantable (yes/no) and life-sustaining (yes/no).

Premarket Study Evidence: Pivotal Studies

There are two types of premarket clinical studies for medical devices – non-pivotal studies (e.g., small-scale feasibility studies) and pivotal studies, which generally serve as the primary basis for device clearance.(10) Using previously described methods, we reviewed publicly available documents within the FDA De Novo database to identify all pivotal clinical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

studies supporting clearance of devices in our sample.(11) We categorized each pivotal study by the following characteristics: total number of patients enrolled, total number of patients enrolled in treatment device group, comparator type (active/sham/pre-post comparison/historical/none), randomization (yes/no), blinding (yes/no), study arms (single/multiple), study location (US/Outside US/mixed), number of study centers (single-center/multi-center), and duration of longest primary effectiveness endpoint follow-up. For each study, we categorized all primary endpoints by the following characteristics: outcome type (safety/effectiveness), effectiveness endpoint type (clinical outcome/clinical scale/surrogate marker), and endpoint met (yes/no/not specified).(11)

Postmarket Experience: Postmarketing Requirements, Recalls, and Subsequent 510(k) Devices

We characterized FDA postmarket experience with devices in our sample by several means. First, we identified all FDA-required postmarket studies of these devices. FDA-required postmarket studies are intended to complement premarket understanding of device benefits and risks. To identify postmarket study requirements, we queried the 522 Studies database on March 22, 2020 by device application number.(12) The FDA may order 522 Studies for moderate- or high-risk devices when device failure would be reasonably likely to cause significant health problems. We categorized each required postmarket study by purpose (evaluation of safety/evaluation of effectiveness).

Second, we extracted the recall history of the De Novo devices in our sample using the FDA Recalls of Medical Devices database. We queried this database on March 1, 2020, using device application numbers to determine if a device was recalled and, if applicable, the FDA-designated recall class (Class I – highest risk/Class II – moderate risk/Class III – low risk).(13)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Third, we identified all 510(k) clearances of new models and competitor products based on De Novo devices in our sample. For each device, we queried the FDA 510(k) database on March 13, 2020,(14) using FDA-designated product codes. We collected the dates of first clearance for: (1) new models marketed by De Novo manufacturers and; (2) first competitor devices marketed by other manufacturers. We also collected the number of 510(k) clearances for each device and market lifespan (in days) as of March 13, 2020.

Statistical Analysis

We used descriptive statistics to characterize therapeutic De Novo devices, premarket pivotal studies and primary endpoints, postmarket study requirements, and 510(k) device lineages. For each De Novo device linked to a subsequent 510(k) device, we calculated median time to first 510(k) device, median time to first competitor device clearance, and median number of subsequent 510(k) clearances per year. All analyses were performed in Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Corporation; Redmond, Washington, USA).

RESULTS

Device Cohort

Between January 1, 2011, and December 31, 2019, the FDA cleared 210 first-of-a-kind devices through the De Novo pathway (**Figure 1**). Among these 210 devices, 68 (32.4%) were therapeutic. Of those 68 devices, 65 (95.6%) were FDA-classified as moderate-risk. Of these 65 devices, decision summary documents were available in the FDA's De Novo database for 63 (96.9%).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Among these 63 first-of-a-kind moderate-risk therapeutic devices, the FDA classified zero (0.0%) as life-sustaining and 10 (15.9%) as implantable (**Table 1**). The most commonly represented medical specialties were neurology (18 of 63: 28.6%), gastroenterology and urology (13 of 63: 20.6%), and general and plastic surgery (10 of 63: 15.9%). Nearly three-quarters (48 of 63: 76.2%) were cleared through the direct De Novo pathway, with the remainder (15 of 63: 23.8%) cleared following FDA denial of a preceding 510(k) application.

Premarket Study Evidence: Pivotal Studies

Among the 63 moderate-risk, therapeutic medical devices, 12 (19.0%) devices were not supported by a pivotal study; instead, these devices were cleared on the basis of non-pivotal (feasibility) studies, literature review of similar devices, or postmarket data from other localities such as the European Union (**Table 2**). Examples of De Novo devices that were not supported by premarket pivotal studies include a transesophageal core temperature cooling device, a cerebrospinal fluid drainage system for patients with post-operative neurologic deficits, and a fertility planning software.

In total, we identified 54 pivotal studies supporting the clearance of 51 (of 63; 81.0%) devices (**Table 3**). Among pivotal studies, 31 (57.4%) were randomized, 23 (42.6%) were blinded, 41 (75.9%) were multi-center, and 33 (61.1%) were multi-armed. Among multi-armed studies, 14 (42.4%) used an active comparator and 19 (57.6%) used a sham comparator. Among single-armed studies, 8 (38.1%) used participant pre/post comparisons, 11 (52.4%) used no comparator, and 2 (9.5%) used a historical comparator (**Table 3)**. Median study enrollment for all pivotal studies was 112.5 patients (IQR: 73.5-187). For multi-armed pivotal studies, median

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

study enrollment was 150 (IQR: 100-206) patients and the median treatment group enrollment was 89 (IQR: 49-118.5) patients.

We identified 60 primary effectiveness endpoints within these 54 pivotal studies; FDA documents specified no primary endpoint for five studies supporting five devices (**Table 4**). Of those 60 primary effectiveness endpoints, 36 (60.0%) evaluated clinical outcomes (e.g., reduction in hemhorrhoids rate during child delivery), 17 (28.3%) were clinical scales (e.g., reduction in Reflux Symptom Index), and 7 (11.7%) were surrogate markers of disease (e.g., increase in number of active Meibomian glands). The median duration of longest primary effectiveness endpoint follow up was 1.0 months (IQR: 0.0-3.0 months) for non-implantable devices and 9.5 months (IQR: 3.5-12.0 months) for implantable devices. All 27 (100.0%) primary safety endpoints were met.

Among primary effectiveness endpoints, 66.7% (n=40) were met, 30.0% (n=18) were not met, and 3.3% (n=2) did not have their success/failure disclosed within FDA documents. In total, 17 (of 54; 31.5%) pivotal studies supporting 15 (of 63; 23.8%) devices failed at least one primary effectiveness endpoint. FDA reasons for clearing these devices included the success of a co-primary endpoint, post hoc analyses suggesting benefit, and lower risk profile than therapeutic alternatives (e.g., pharmaceutical agents) (**Table 5**). Examples of De Novo devices that were supported by pivotal studies that failed primary effectiveness endpoints include a transcutaneous vagal nerve stimulator for migraine prophylaxis, treatment for urinary incontence, and embolic protection system used during transcather aortic valve replacement procedures.

Postmarket Experience: Postmarketing Requirements and Recalls

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Between 2011 and 2019, the FDA required a postmarket study for one (of 63; 1.6%) therapeutic De Novo device. This device was a powered exoskeleton indicated to help patients with weakened or paralyzed limbs ambulate. This study was intended to examine the long-term safety of the device because failure could result in fall-related injuries. This device was subsequently recalled due to postmarket reports of patients suffering injury to their tibias and fibulas.

The vast majority (n=57 of 63; 90.5%) of De Novo devices were not recalled. Six devices (of 63: 9.5%) underwent class II (i.e., moderate-risk) recalls. Three devices were recalled due to shipping problems or improper device labeling. One device - an endoscopic hemostat for gastrointestinal bleeding - was recalled due to a malfunction with the potential to delay hemostasis. Two devices - a robotic system for benign prostatic hyperplasia and a localized heating device for chronic eyelid cysts - were recalled due to component issues that resulted in device failures.

Postmarket Experience: Subsequent 510(k) Devices

Thirty-two (of 63: 50.8%) moderate-risk therapeutic De Novo devices served as the predicate for at least one device subsequently cleared via the 510(k) process (i.e., 510[k] devices). Among these De Novo devices, the median number of 510(k) devices was 2.5 (IQR: 1-5) and the median number of 510(k) devices per year was 0.74 (IQR: 0.54-1.14). The median time from initial De Novo clearance to first 510(k) device clearance was 202 (IQR: 159-302) days.

Sixteen (of 63; 25.4%) De Novo devices served as the basis for at least one device from a competing manufacturer. For these 16 devices, the median time from initial De Novo clearance

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

to first competing manufacturer 510(k) device was 364 (IQR: 184.5-632.0) days. The competitor product served as the first 510(k) device for the majority (n=11 of 16; 68.8%) of these devices.

Eleven devices served as the basis for 510(k) devices marketed by both the De Novo device manufacturer and and a competing device manufacturer. For these devices, the median time to first competing manufacturer 510(k) device was 426 (IQR: 161.5-678.5) days after De Novo clearance and the median time to first De Novo manufacturer 510(k) device was 439 (IQR: 220-552) days.

DISCUSSION

We found substantial variation in the strength of evidence supporting first-of-a-kind therapeutic medical devices cleared via the De Novo pathway between 2011 and 2019. The majority of devices were cleared based on evidence from pivotal clinical studies. Among pivotal studies, most were randomized, multi-armed studies with an active or sham comparator. However, 43% of devices were not evaluated through pivotal studies or supported by pivotal studies with at least one failed primary effectiveness endpoint

Despite these potential limitations in premarket evidence, the FDA required only one device – a powered exoskeleton – to undergo postmarket study. This device was subsequently recalled after causing lower extremity injuries. Nonetheless, overall few devices were recalled. These safety findings are reassuring, as nearly half of De Novo devices in our cohort served as a predicate device for a subsequent 510(k) device, including nearly a quarter that served as a predicate for a competitor product.

To our knowledge, our study is the first to systematically review medical devices cleared via the FDA De Novo pathway. In contrast to the oft scrutinized 510(k) process,(2,15) the De Novo

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

pathway typically requires manufacturers to submit clinical evidence of device safety and effectiveness. When pivotal studies are not required, the FDA often considers alternative clinical data sources, although these may be limited by biases due to selective publication or the challenges detecting postmarket safety signals.(16,17) When pivotal studies are required, premarket clinical evidence is generally less rigorous than that required for approval of high-risk devices via the Premarket Approval pathway.(11,18) Less stringent evidentiary requirements are consistent with the original FDA aim of reducing barriers to market for these comparatively lower-risk devices, but have widespread implications for patients and clinicians in the U.S. and worldwide.

Much variability in the strength of premarket evidence supporting De Novo devices may be due to the diverse range of regulated technologies and indications for use. For instance, the evidentiary bar for a software based weight management aid might be reasonably lower than that for a balloon valvuloplasty catheter for treating aortic stenosis; both devices were cleared via the De Novo pathway. However, our findings reveal that the FDA often exercises regulatory disecretion when devices fail to acheive primary effectiveness endpoints. For such devices, the FDA determines probable benefit based on post-hoc analyses, alternative clinical data sources, and comparison to therapeutic alternatives. Though these determinations may be prone to biases,(19) such insight into the decision-making process is only possible as a result of the FDA's commitment to transparency. In contrast, evaluation of premarket evidence supporting medical device approval in Europe has been limited by confidentiality laws, though stakeholders have expressed concerns regarding regulatory approval standards.(20,21)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

De Novo device manufacturers may be reluctant to invest in more rigorous clinical studies under the current regulatory framework for moderate-risk devices. At present, these manufacturers are usually required to conduct potentially uncertain, costly, or time-intensive studies in order to obtain FDA clearance. In contrast, competing manufacturers are often able to market similar devices within a year of De Novo clearance via the 510(k) process, which does not usually require premarket clinical evidence for clearance. To incentivize manufacturers to generate stronger evidence, the FDA could further collaborate with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to align market clearance with payment policy. For example, the FDA and CMS could expand utilization of collaborative parallel premarket review programs to help expedite coverage for devices supported by compelling pivotal clinical data.(22,23)

The FDA could also directly work with European regulators to harmonize evidentiary standards and premarket review for De Novo devices. Such collaboration may be possible under the new European device regulation system, effective as of May 2021. European approval standards are generally less stringent than US regulations.(21) As a result, manufacturers often launch devices in Europe in order to expedite initial revenue generation.(21) This paradigm often enables the FDA to rely upon postmarket data from Europe during premarket review, as was the case for several devices in our sample. However, evidentiary standards under the new European systems are more congruent with FDA requirements. Coordinated efforts to establish transparent, device-level evidentiary standards could enable both regulators to achieve important longstanding aims – faster US patient access relative to European standards and safer European devices relative to US standards. Furthermore, regulatory harmonization could eliminate the need for manufacturers to conduct separate premarket studies to support European and US

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

approval. Reducing capital and time requirements in this manner may incentive manufacturers to invest in more rigorous pivotal studies.

The FDA and CMS could additionally leverage real-world data to evaluate these devices, which were largely cleared without comparative outcomes data. Key stakeholders in the medical device ecosystem – such as the FDA, payors, and manufacturers – are now developing the National Evaluation System for Health Technology (NEST) to enable timely real-world evidence generation to fill this gap.(24) For example, NEST has funded a randomized clinical study of the effect of the Apple Watch electrocardiogram and irregular rhythm notification features (both cleared via the De Novo pathway in 2018) on patient-reported outcomes and clinical utilization (of note, this study is being conducted by SSD and JSR). More expeditious integration of Unique Device Identifiers into electronic data sources, particularly electronic health records and claims, would also facilitate real-world data based evaluations of De Novo devices.(17,25) The European-based Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Healthcare and National Institute for Health and Care Excellence provide a model for the US to use real-world data to make recommendations that guide clinical practice. Data sharing and collaboration with such institutes could additionally strengthen protections against ineffective or unsafe devices for patients and payors in the US and abroad.

Our study has several limitations. First, we restricted analysis to therapeutic devices and our findings may therefore not be generalizable to all devices cleared via the De Novo pathway. Second, our analysis was cross-sectional. It is possible that additional postmarket studies will be required, more recalls will occur, and more 510(k) devices will be cleared for the devices in our sample. Third, our study is limited by the quality and availability of information within FDA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

review documents. Inaccuracies or omissions within these documents may have influenced our results.

In conclusion, the De Novo pathway has served as an increasingly important path to market for first-of-a-kind therapeutic devices. These devices rapidly serve as the basis for new models and competitor products. Although experience to date suggests that De Novo devices are largely safe, important questions about device effectiveness remain unanswered. Enhanced postmarket surveillance and collaboration with key stakeholders such as European regulators may enable the FDA to best utilize this pathway in the service of patients moving forward.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Medical Device Amendments of 1976 [Internet]. Public Law 94-295 May 28, 1976. Available from: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-90/pdf/STATUTE-90-Pg539.pdf

2. Institute of Medicine. Medical devices and the public's health: the FDA 510(k) clearance process at 35 years. National Academies Press; 2011.

3. US Food and Drug Administration. The 510(k) Program: Evaluating Substantial Equivalence in Premarket Notifications [510(k)]. 2014 Jul 28;42.

4. Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997 [Internet]. Public Law 105-115 Nov 21, 1997. Available from: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-105publ115/pdf/PLAW-105publ115.pdf

5. US Food and Drug Administration. De Novo Classification Request [Internet]. FDA. FDA; 2019 [cited 2020 Apr 22]. Available from: http://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/premarket-submissions/de-novo-classification-request

6. FDA's De Novo Program Gains Momentum | RAPS [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 22]. Available from: https://www.raps.org/news-and-articles/news-articles/2019/4/fdas-de-novo-program-gains-momentum

7. Device Classification under Section 513(f)(2)(de novo) [Internet]. [cited 2019 Oct 9]. Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/denovo.cfm

8. Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Evaluation of Automatic Class III Designation (De Novo) Summaries. FDA [Internet]. 2020 Feb 26 [cited 2020 Apr 22]; Available from: http://www.fda.gov/about-fda/cdrh-transparency/evaluation-automatic-class-iii-designation-de-novo-summaries

9. Product Classification [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 22]. Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPCD/classification.cfm

10. US Department of Health and Human Services. Design Considerations for Pivotal Clinical Investigations for Medical Devices: Design Considerations for Pivotal Clinical Investigations for Medical Devices [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2020 Apr 22]. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/media/87363/download

11. Rathi VK, Krumholz HM, Masoudi FA, Ross JS. Characteristics of Clinical Studies Conducted Over the Total Product Life Cycle of High-Risk Therapeutic Medical Devices Receiving FDA Premarket Approval in 2010 and 2011. JAMA. 2015 Aug 11;314(6):604–12.

12. 522 Postmarket Surveillance Studies [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 22]. Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pss.cfm?s=t

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

13. Medical Device Recalls [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 22]. Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfRES/res.cfm

14. 510(k) Premarket Notification [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 22]. Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfPMN/pmn.cfm

15. Ross JS, Kesselheim AS. FDA Policy and Cardiovascular Medicine. Circulation. 2015 Sep 22;132(12):1136–45.

16. Chang L, Dhruva SS, Chu J, Bero LA, Redberg RF. Selective reporting in trials of high risk cardiovascular devices: cross sectional comparison between premarket approval summaries and published reports. BMJ. 2015 Jun 10;350:h2613.

17. Rising J, Moscovitch B. The Food and Drug Administration's Unique Device Identification System: Better Postmarket Data on the Safety and Effectiveness of Medical Devices. JAMA Intern Med. 2014 Nov 1;174(11):1719–20.

18. Jones LC, Dhruva SS, Redberg RF. Assessment of Clinical Trial Evidence for High-Risk Cardiovascular Devices Approved Under the Food and Drug Administration Priority Review Program. JAMA Intern Med. 2018 Oct 1;178(10):1418–20.

19. Razavi M, Glasziou P, Klocksieben FA, Ioannidis JPA, Chalmers I, Djulbegovic B. US Food and Drug Administration Approvals of Drugs and Devices Based on Nonrandomized Clinical Trials: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 2019 Sep 4;2(9):e1911111–e1911111.

20. Thompson M, Heneghan C, Billingsley M, Cohen D. Medical device recalls and transparency in the UK. BMJ [Internet]. 2011 May 14 [cited 2020 Apr 22];342. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/content/342/bmj.d2973

21. Hwang TJ, Sokolov E, Franklin JM, Kesselheim AS. Comparison of rates of safety issues and reporting of trial outcomes for medical devices approved in the European Union and United States: cohort study. BMJ. 2016 Jun 28;353:i3323.

22. Program for Parallel Review of Medical Devices [Internet]. Federal Register. 2016 [cited 2020 Apr 22]. Available from: https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/10/24/2016-25659/program-for-parallel-review-of-medical-devices

23. Roginiel AC, Dhruva SS, Ross JS. Evidence supporting FDA approval and CMS national coverage determinations for novel medical products, 2005 through 2016: A cross-sectional study. Medicine (Baltimore). 2018 Oct;97(40):e12715.

24. Shuren J, Califf RM. Need for a National Evaluation System for Health Technology. JAMA. 2016 Sep 20;316(11):1153–4.

25. Dhruva SS, Ross JS, Schulz WL, Krumholz HM. Fulfilling the Promise of Unique Device Identifiers. Ann Intern Med. 2018 07;169(3):183–5.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

FIGURES

Figure 1. Sample Construction of Therapeutic Moderate-Risk De Novo devices Cleared Between 2011 and 2019



Caption. Sample construction of therapeutic moderate-risk De Novo devices cleared between 2011 and 2019

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TABLES

Table 1. First-of-a-kind moderate-risk therapeutic devices cleared by the US Food and Drug Administration through the De Novo Pathway Between 2011 and 2019

	No. (%) (n = 63)
Approval Year	
2011-2014	20 (31.7)
2015-2019	43 (68.3)
Application Type	
Direct De Novo	48 (76.2)
Post 510(k) Denial	15 (23.8)
Specialty	
Neurology	18 (28.6)
Gastroenterology and Urology	13 (20.6)
General & Plastic Surgery	10 (15.9)
Otolaryngology	5 (7.9)
Ophthalmology	4 (6.3)
Anesthesiology	4 (6.3)
Cardiovascular	3 (4.8)
Other	6 (9.5)
Review Type[a]	
Standard	62 (98.4)
Expedited	1 (1.6)
Implantable	
Yes	10 (15.9)
No	53 (84.1)
Life Sustaining	
Yes	0 (0)
No	63 (100)
FDA Required Postmarket Study	
Yes	1 (1.6)
No	62 (98.4)
Highest Recall Class	
Class I	0
Class II	6 (9.5)
Class III	0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

No Recall	57 (90.5)

[a]Expedited indicates review via the FDA Priority Review Program, which was intended to facilitate patient access to therapies addressing unmet medical needs in the treatment of serious or life-threatening conditions

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Clinical Evidence Supporting De Novo devices not supported by a premarket pivotal study

Application Number	Device Manufacturer	Device Name	Clearance Date	Device Specialty	FDA[a] Cleared Clinical Indication	Clinical Evidence Submitted
DEN180058	Tandem Diabetes Care, Inc.	t:slim X2 insulin pump with interoperable technology	2/14/2019	Clinical Chemistry	Subcutaneous delivery of insulin, at set and variable rates, for the management of diabetes mellitus in persons requiring insulin.	No clinical data included in decision summary
DEN180013	KCI USA, Inc.	Prevena 125 and Prevena Plus 125 Therapy Units	4/19/2019	General & Plastic Surgery	Aid in reducing the incidence of post-operative seroma and – in high-risk patients – the risk of superficial surgical site infections	Systematic review and meta-analysis c 16 clinical studies evaluating the device, including 2 previously unpublished manufacturer-sponsored trials.
DEN170052	Natural Cycles Nordic AB	Natural Cycles	8/10/2018	Obstetrics/ Gynecology	Fertility monitoring software for women > 18 years to help plan or prevent pregnancy	Real-world postmarket data from 37 countries outside the United States
DEN170044	Thornhill Research, Inc.	ClearMate	3/14/2019	Anesthesiology	Adjunctive treatment to be used by emergency department clinicians for patients suffering from carbon monoxide poisoning.	- Literature review of 5 published studies evaluating the device. - European study evaluating device foı different indication used to support device safety
DEN170015	Wilson-Cook Medical, Inc	Hemospray Endoscopic Hemostat	5/7/2018	General & Plastic Surgery	Hemostasis of non-variceal gastrointestinal bleeding.	- One pilot premarket study - Two postmarket studies outside the United States
DEN160040	Biosphere Medical S.A.	Embosphere Microspheres	6/21/2017	Gastroenterology & Urology	Embolization of arteriovenous malformations, hypervascular tumors, including symptomatic uterine fibroids, and prostatic arteries for symptomatic benign prostatic hyperplasia .	- Review of literature supporting devic use for intended indication. - Partial results from 3 ongoing phase trials - Database from outside the United States (400+ patients)
DEN140018	Advanced Cooling Therapy, LLC	Esophageal Cooling Device	6/23/2015	Cardiovascular	1. Control patient temperature control patient temperature, and 2. Provide gastric decompression and suctioning	Outside the United States postmarket clinical data from 16 patients
DEN130016	Revmedx, Inc.	XSTAT	4/3/2014	General & Plastic Surgery	Temporary (maximum 4 hours) control of bleeding from junctional wounds in the groin or axilla not amenable to tourniquet application in adults and adolescents. Intended for battlefield use.	No clinical data

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

DEN120017	Medtronic Neurosurgery	Medtronic DUET External Drainage and Monitoring System	8/22/2014	Neurology	Temporary drainage and monitoring of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) flow from the lumbar subarachnoid space in: 1. Patients undergoing open descending thoracic aortic aneurysm (open TAA) or open descending thoraco-abdominal aortic aneurysm (open TAAA) repair surgery. 2. Patients post TAA/TAAA repair that become symptomatic with neurological deficit such as paraplegia.	Review of 5 published studies evaluating CSF draining apparatuses with similar characteristics to the device (n=5) for device indications
DEN100025	Office Research in Clinical Amplification	Widexlink in Clear Series Hearing Aids	3/31/2011	Ear Nose Throat	Auditory amplification for individuals with a full range of hearing loss severity (from slight (16 to 25 dB HL) to profound (90+ dB HL)) and all hearing loss configurations.	FDA-requested pilot study (n=12 patients)
DEN080015	Numed, Inc.	Nucleus-X PTV Catheter	6/11/2012	Cardiovascular	Balloon aortic valvuloplasty for the treatment of aortic valve stenosis.	Review of literature (n=3 studies) on worldwide experience with balloon aortic valvuloplasty, including studies evaluating the Nucleus family of catheters
DEN170086	Allergan	TrueTear Intranasal Tear Neurostimulator	5/17/2018	Ophthalmology	Provides temporary increase in tear production during neurostimulation to improve dry eye symptoms in adult patients with severe dry eye symptoms.	De Novo clearance was for expanded indications from another De Novo device in the analyzed cohort. Clearance was supported by additional analysis of pivotal trials supporting fir De Novo device, evaluating device effectiveness at symptom relief, but nc new pivotal trials supported new De Novo clearance

[a]FDA denotes the US Food and Drug Administration

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Characteristics of Pivotal Studies Supporting US Food and Drug Administration Clearance of De Novo Classification Therapeutic Medical Devices Between 2011 and 2019

	Pivotal Studies (n = 54)
No. Pivotal Studies per Device, Median (IQR)	1.0 (1.0-1.0)
Total Enrollment, Median (IQR)	112.5 (73.5-187)
Treatment Group Enrollment (IQR)	89 (49-118.5)
Study Arms	
Multi-Armed	33 (61.1%)
Single Armed	21 (38.9%)
Randomized, No. (%)	31 (57.4%)
Blinding, No. (%)	
Blinded	23 (42.6%)
Open Label	23 (42.6%)
Not Specified	8 (14.8%)
Comparator Type, No. (%)	
Active	14 (25.9%)
Sham	19 (35.2%)
Historical	2 (3.7%)
Pre-Post Comparison	8 (14.8%)
None	11 (20.4%)
Centers	
Multicenter	41 (75.9%)
Single Center	3 (5.6%)
Not Specified	10 (18.5%)
Locations	
All US	10 (18.5%)
Some US	10 (18.5%)
No US	2 (3.7%)
Not Specified	32 (59.3%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4. Characteristics of Primary Effectivess Endpoints of Pivotal Studies Supporting US Food and Drug Administration Clearance of De Novo Classification Therapeutic Medical Devices Between 2011 and 2019

	Pivotal Premarket Effectiveness Endpoints (n = 60)[a]
Endpoint Type, No. (%)	
Clinical Endpoint	36 (60.0%)
Clinical Scale	17 (28.3%)
Surrogate Marker	7 (11.7%)
Median Duration of Longest Follow-Up (months) (IQR)	
Overall	1.0 (0.0 - 6.0)
Non-Implantable	1.0 (0.0 - 3.0)
Implantable	9.5 (3.5 - 12.0)
Primary Endpoint(s) Met	
Yes	40 (66.7%)
No	18 (30.0%)
Endpoint(s) Success not Evaluated	2 (3.3%)

Notes: FDA=Food and Drug Administration; IQR=Interquartile Range

[a] Does not include 5 pivotal studies supporting 5 devices without a primary effectiveness endpoint

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 5. FDA Rationale for Clearance of De Novo Devices with one or more missed primary effectiveness endpoints in supporting pivotal studies

Device Name	FDA-Cleared Clinical Indication	Failed Primary Endpoint	Rationale Supporting FDA[a] Clearance
Virulite Cold Sore Machine	Reduce healing time for herpes simplex labialis lesions on or around the lips	Time to healing from cold sore onset	-Literature review of device and similar devices provided reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness - Low risk profile of device
Symphony Device	Improve sleep quality for patients with primary Restless Legs Syndrome (RLS)	Mean change from baseline in International Restless Leg Syndrome total score to week 1, 2, 3, and 4[b]	Improvements in sleep quality (secondary endpoint) Lower risk profile than treatment alternatives (i.e., pharmaceuticals)
Cefaly	Prophylactic treatment of episodic migraine in patients ≥ 18 years	Decrease in monthly migraine days against sham device group	-Success of co-primary endpoint (difference in responder (having a 50% reduction in monthly migraines) rate in treatment group vs. sham group) -Non-statistically significant trend in endpoint improvement Lower risk profile than treatment alternatives (i.e., pharmaceuticals)
Zanza-Click	Temporary reduction of the swelling and itching caused by mosquito bites.	Percent of patients with 40% itch reduction vs sham group	-Success of co-primary endpoint -Availability of device and similar devices OUS -Low risk profile of device
Cereve Sleep System	Reduce sleep latency to Stage 1 and Stage 2 sleep in patients with primary insomnia.	1. Latency to persistent sleep vs sham group 2. Sleep efficiency vs sham group	-Decreased time to Stage 1 and Stage 2 sleep (incidental finding during additional analysis) - Low risk profile of device
Sensor Monitored Alimentary Restriction Therapy (SMART) Device	Aid in weight management in overweight to obese (body mass index between range 27-35 kg/m2)individuals the in conjunction with behavioral modification instruction.	40% of the treatment group participants will lose more that 5% of their total body weight compared to under 10% of control group patients	-Lack of weight gain in treatment group - Low risk profile of device
gammaCore Non-invasive Vagus Nerve Stimulator	Acute treatment of pain associated with episodic cluster headache in adult patients.	Rate of responders in the treatment group vs the sham group. A responder is defined as having recorded a headache intensity of 0 or 1 on a 5 point scale 15 minutes post-treatment with device.	- Positive trend for missed primary endpoint -Post-hoc analysis demonstrating clinically meaningfu improvement of first headache attack. - - Low risk profile of device
SkinPen Precision System	Improve the appearance of facial acne scars in adults aged 22 years or older.	Grading of patient photographs at 1 and 6 months post treatment by two blinded dermatologists using the Clinician's Global Aesthetic Improvement Assessment	- Success of co-primary endpoint (improvement on Acne Scar Assessment scale at 6 months compared to baseline) -Non-statistically significant trend in endpoint improvement Lower risk profile than treatment alternatives

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20077164; this version posted April 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

dermaPACE System	Treatment of chronic, full-thickness diabetic foot ulcers in conjunction with standard diabetic ulcer care.	Complete closure of target ulcer at 12 weeks[b]	-Post-hoc analysis demonstrating clinically meaningfu benefit at 24 weeks - Low risk profile of device
Sentinel Cerebral Protection System	Embolic protection device to capture and remove thrombus/debris while performing transcatheter aortic valve replacement procedures.	Comparison between treatment and control group patients of total new lesion volume in protected territories at 2 to 7 days post procedure assessed by diffusion weighted MRI	- Success of one of two criterion of primary effectiveness endpoint (30% reduction in 2-7 day lesion volume on diffusion-weighted MRI) -Low risk profile of device per FDA
IlluminOss Bone Stabilization System	Treatment of impending and actual pathological fractures in skeletally mature patients of the humerus, radius, and ulna, from metastatic bone disease.	Mean improvement in Visual Analog Scale pain score over 90 days of greater than 80% of historical reference	-Co-primary endpoint success -Positive trend for missed primary endpoint
SEM Scanner (Model 200)	Adjunct to standard of care when assessing the heels and sacrum of patients who are at increased risk for pressure ulcers.	Specifity of 55% or greater	- Success of co-primary endpoint (met sensitivity cutoff for detecting pressure ulcers) -Low risk profile of device
Cala ONE	Transient relief of hand tremors in adults with essential tremor.	Significantly greater change in treatment vs sham group in TETRAS Archimededs spiral rating after stimulation compared to baseline	-Improved tremor control versus baseline (not prespecified endpoint) -Low risk profile of device
Innovo	Treatment of stress urinary incontinence in adult females	Comparison of percentage of patients with at least 50% reducting in Provocative Pad Weight Test at 12 weeks between active control and treatment group	-Improved urinary incontinence control versus baselin (not prespecified endpoint) -Low risk profile of device
Plenity	Aid in weight management in overweight and obese (body mass index of 25 - 40 kg/m^2) when used in conjunction with diet and exercise.	3% superiority margin of total body weight loss in the treatment group vs the sham group	-Success of co-primary endpoint and secondary endpoints -Similar adverse event rate to sham control

[a]FDA denotes the US Food and Drug Administration

[b]Device was supported by two pivotal studies with the same missed primary effectiveness endpoint