Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2026) 16(2), 1914-1917 | ISSN:2251-6727

Regulatory Frameworks and Transparency Challenges in Artificial Intelligence-Enabled Medical Devices: A Global Perspective

Brundha R[1], Arulprakasam K C*[2], Kalaiselvi C[3], Senthilkumar B[4], Senthilkumar N[5]

1. Final M.Pharm., Department of Regulatory Affairs , JKKMMRFs –Annai JKK Sampoorani ammal college of Pharmacy, B.Komarapalayam, Namakkal Dt.

2. Professor & HOD, Department of Pharmacy Practice, JKKMMRFs –Annai JKK Sampoorani ammal college of Pharmacy, B.Komarapalayam, Namakkal Dt, Tamil nadu, Affiliated by The Tamil nadu Dr MGR medical university, Chennai.

3. Professor ., Department of Regulatory Affairs , JKKMMRFs –Annai JKK Sampoorani ammal college of Pharmacy, B.Komarapalayam, Namakkal Dt.

4. Professor ., Department of Regulatory Affairs , JKKMMRFs –Annai JKK Sampoorani ammal college of Pharmacy, B.Komarapalayam, Namakkal Dt

5. Principal, JKKMMRFS –Annai JKK Sampoorani Ammal college of Pharmacy, B.Komarapalayam, Namakkal Dt Affiliated by The Tamil nadu Dr MGR medical university, Chennai

(Received: 16 January 2026 Revised: 25 February 2026 Accepted: 17 March 2026)

KEYWORDS

Artificial intelligence, medical devices, regulatory frameworks, transparency , ethics, post-market surveillance, global harmonization

ABSTRACT:

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in medical devices has revolutionized diagnostics, risk prediction, and treatment planning. However, regulatory frameworks defining the safety, efficacy, and ethical deployment of AI-enabled medical devices remain fragmented and evolving. This article presents a comprehensive review of current regulatory approaches in major jurisdictions—United States, European Union, and Asia-Pacific—highlighting disparities, best practices, and emerging models such as Predetermined Change Control Plans (PCCPs). The discussion emphasizes persistent transparency issues, including underrepresentation of minority populations in clinical datasets, lack of explainability, and inconsistent post-market surveillance. Recent guidance from the U.S. FDA, the EU AI Act, and the British MHRA are analyzed to map regulatory trends and identify gaps. The findings underscore the need for harmonized standards, robust transparency requirements, and stakeholder-driven accountability. Suggestions for future regulatory alignment, improved data reporting, and the integration of ethical AI-by-design principles are provided to enhance global health equity and patient safety. This article serves as a foundation for policymakers and researchers aiming to strengthen regulatory oversight of AI in healthcare

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming healthcare by enabling rapid image analysis, predictive diagnostics, and personalized treatment pathways. Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) and AI-enabled medical devices are increasingly central to clinical decision-making, but their regulatory landscape is marked by significant disparities and evolving standards. While the U.S. FDA, the European Union, and Asian regulatory bodies have introduced new guidelines, the pace of AI innovation outpaces regulatory adaptation. This creates challenges for global market access, patient safety, and ethical integrity.[1][2][3][4][5][6]

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2026) 16(2), 1914-1917 | ISSN:2251-6727

A key concern is the limited transparency surrounding AI-driven medical devices. Many regulatory submissions lack demographic information on training data, obscuring potential biases and performance disparities across diverse populations. Regulatory scrutiny is also inconsistent, with some jurisdictions requiring extensive pre-market validation while others permit post-market updates with minimal oversight. This article analyzes the evolving regulatory frameworks, evaluates the impact of recent policy changes, and proposes recommendations for harmonization and transparency to ensure safe, effective, and equitable deployment of AI in healthcare.[7][8][9][10]

Review of Literature

Recent literature highlights the global proliferation of AI in medical devices, with regulatory attention focused on safety, efficacy, and ethical delivery. The U.S. FDA has advanced its Digital Health Innovation Action Plan, emphasizing the importance of Total Product Lifecycle (TPLC) management and introducing PCCPs to manage post-market updates. The European Union's AI Act, enacted in 2024, introduces rigorous conformity assessment for high-risk AI systems, including medical devices, and mandates transparency and explainability. Asian jurisdictions, such as China and Japan, have adopted similar lifecycle-based approaches, with an emphasis on harmonization and risk-factor management.[2][3][8][11][9][4][5][1]

Despite these advances, transparency remains a critical issue. Studies show that most approved AI medical devices lack detailed demographic reporting, raising concerns about bias and fairness. There is also a growing consensus on the need for ethical AI-by-design, with accountability and patient-centered approaches embedded in regulatory frameworks.[12][13][10][14][7]

Materials & Methods

This study employs a systematic review of regulatory guidance documents, policy statements, and peer-reviewed literature published between 2019 and 2025. Sources include the U.S. FDA, European Union, Chinese NMPA, and key international journals. The synthesis compares regulatory frameworks across regions, focusing on:

- Pre-market approval requirements
- Post-market surveillance and change management
- Transparency and accountability mandates
- Ethical considerations and stakeholder engagement

Tables and figures are designed to summarize key regulatory features, demographic reporting standards, and policy recommendations.

Results

Table 1: Key Regulatory Features Across Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction	Pre-market Approval	Post-market Surveillance	Transparency Requirements	Change Management
U.S. FDA	510(k), PMA	Adverse event reporting	PCCP, demographic data	PCCP, TPLC [1][9]
EU (AI Act)	CE + AI Act cert.	Real-world monitoring	Algorithm documentation	Complex compliance [3][11]
China (NMPA)	Case-by-case review	TPLC, updates	Risk & data standards	Harmonized updates [2][4]
UK (MHRA)	SaMD guidelines	Cybersecurity audits	Bias mitigation	Evolving updates [2]

Figure 1 (Suggested): Global Regulatory Approval Pathways for AI Medical Devices

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2026) 16(2), 1914-1917 | ISSN:2251-6727

- Timeline of regulatory changes (2019–2025)
- Key milestones and policy documents

Table 2: Transparency and Demographic Reporting in AI Device Approvals

Device Type	Demographic Data Reported	Bias Testing	Algorithm Explainability
FDA-approved	23% [7]	Limited	Limited
EU-approved	45% [12]	Moderate	High (AI Act)
Asia-approved	30% [4]	Low	Moderate

Discussion

The regulatory landscape for AI-enabled medical devices is evolving rapidly, but significant disparities persist. The U.S. FDA's PCCP and TPLC framework represent a robust approach to managing post-market updates and transparency, though adoption remains inconsistent. The EU AI Act's emphasis on transparency and accountability sets a new global standard, requiring manufacturers to document algorithms and explain AI-driven decisions. Asian jurisdictions are making progress, but efforts to harmonize regulatory standards internationally are still in their early stages.[3][11][9][4][1][2]

A critical gap is the lack of comprehensive demographic reporting in regulatory submissions. Without detailed data on the diversity of training populations, it is difficult to assess algorithmic bias and ensure equitable outcomes. Future regulatory efforts should mandate transparency in data reporting and encourage stakeholder engagement to ensure that AI systems are developed and deployed responsibly.[10][7]

Table 3: Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Approaches

Framework	Strengths	Limitations
FDA PCCP/TPLC	Flexible, risk-based	Limited transparency mandates
EU AI Act	High transparency, accountability	Complex compliance
Asia (NMPA)	Harmonized, risk-focused	Variable regional standards

Conclusion

The regulatory landscape for AI-enabled medical devices is becoming increasingly sophisticated, with new frameworks improving oversight, transparency, and accountability. However, persistent gaps—especially in demographic reporting and ethical AI-by-design—must be addressed to ensure safe, equitable, and trustworthy deployment of AI in healthcare. Harmonized global standards and stakeholder-driven transparency are essential for advancing regulatory science and public health.

Limitations

This study is limited by the variability in regulatory reporting and the rapid pace of policy change. The analysis is based on published documents and may not reflect the most recent implementation challenges.

Future Scope

Future research should focus on the real-world impact of regulatory frameworks on patient outcomes, the effectiveness of transparency measures, and the development of ethical AI-by-design principles. Harmonization efforts among regulatory bodies are critical to support global market access and equitable health innovation.

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2026) 16(2), 1914-1917 | ISSN:2251-6727

References

1. Muralidharan, A. et al. (2024). Transparency in AI medical devices: A scoping review. *Journal of Medical Artificial Intelligence*, 5(2), 123–135.
2. Palaniappan, K. et al. (2024). Global regulatory frameworks for the use of artificial intelligence in medical devices. *Digital Health*, 10, 1–20.
3. Babic, B. et al. (2025). Global harmonization of AI-enabled medical device regulation. *Nature Digital Medicine*, 8(1), 23–34.
4. Shick, A. A. et al. (2024). Transparency of artificial intelligence/machine learning-enabled medical devices. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 8(3), 212–225.
5. Radanliev, P. et al. (2025). AI Ethics: Integrating Transparency, Fairness, and Privacy in Healthcare. *Technology and Society*, 33, 100–115.
6. FDA. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Medical Products: How CBER, CDER, CDRH, and OCP are Working Together. Retrieved from https://www.fda.gov
7. EU Commission. (2024). AI Act Regulation (EU) 2024/1689.
8. Radanliev, P. et al. (2025). Privacy, Ethics, Transparency, and Accountability in AI-enabled Wearables. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 7, 1–15.
9. Han, Y. et al. (2024). Regulatory frameworks for AI-enabled medical devices in China. *JMIR AI*, 3(1), e1–e12.
10. Weiner, E. B. et al. (2025). Ethical challenges and evolving strategies in the integration of AI in healthcare. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 51(4), 213–227.
11. Zhang, S. et al. (2025). A decade of review in global regulation and research of AI in healthcare. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 7, 1–18.
12. FDA. (2025). Predetermined Change Control Plans for AI-Enabled Medical Device Software.
13. Palaniappan, K. (2024). Regulatory harmonization and AI in healthcare. *Digital Health*, 10, 1–20.
14. EU Health. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in healthcare: Public Health.
15. FDA. (2025). Transparency for Machine Learning-Enabled Medical Devices: Guiding Principle.