Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 603-610 | ISSN:2251-6727

USFDA Regulatory Oversight of Medical Device Recalls

Priyamala Avchar[1] , Girish Kashid[2] , Rahul Chormale[1] ,Akshada Dayma[3], Kalyani Mankar[3] .

[1]Deparment of regulatory affairs, sanjivani college of pharmaceutical education and research ,kopargaon, maharshtra ,india 423601.

[2]Deparment of pharmaceutical chemistry, sanjivani college of pharmaceutical education and research ,kopargaon ,maharshtra ,india 423601.

[3]Vidhyabharti College of Pharmacy Amravati, maharshtra, india 444 602.

(Received: 04 February 2024 Revised: 11 March 2024 Accepted: 08 April 2024)

KEYWORDS

Recall, FDA, Medical devices, PMA, 510k, Voluntary Recall, Mandatory Recall.

ABSTRACT: Medical device recalls in the US, as overseen by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), are essential components of the regulatory framework designed to guarantee the efficaciousness and safety of medical equipment supplied. A summary of the US medical device recall procedure is given in brief by this paper. The FDA's recall system is a crucial mechanism for identifying and addressing issues related to medical devices that pose risks to patients or fail to meet regulatory standards. Recalls can be initiated voluntarily by the manufacturer or mandated by the FDA when a device is found to be in violation of regulations or when a potential health hazard is identified. This study outlines the key elements of a medical device recall, including the various classes of recall, various reasons for the device recall, the roles and responsibilities of manufacturer and the FDA, and the communication and notification procedures for the recall. And also discuss about the 510k approved device recall frequency than PMA approved device recall.

Introduction

The United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) was established at the start of the 20th century with the mission of guaranteeing the safety and effectiveness of medications before they are sold [1]. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act was amended in 1976, which increased the agency's authority to supervise the safety of medical devices [2]. While it usually takes twelve months for a new drug to be approved, it usually only takes 3 to 7 years for new medical devices to be invented and put on the market. [3]. The agency's current role in drug and medical device marketing control was eventually established in the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906 [4,5], which was enacted in recognition of an urgent requirement for restricting interstate markets for tainted and mismanaged food and pharmaceuticals. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act of 1938 mandated the FDA to approve all medications for safety [1]. The Kefauver-Harris amendments included the requirement that medications be shown "effective" as well as safe in 1962, and put severe limits on the use of experimental drugs [4]. In 1976, medication safety regulations were broadened to encompass medical devices [4,5]. In this paper, we will look at the approval process and recalls of medical devices in the US.

Medical Devices

The FDA's Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH) regulates medical devices. A devices, according to the FD&C Act, is "an instrument, apparatus, implement, machine, contrivance, implant, or an in vitro reagent" that gets together with three criteria: a) it has been identified in the official National Formulary or the United States Pharmacopoeia; b) It is meant to have an impact on the structure or operation of the human body; or c) It is intended to be used in the diagnosis of disease or other conditions, or in the treatment, mitigation, cure, or avoidance of disease. [6]. Devices are unable to accomplish their intended objectives via means of chemical reaction or by relying on metabolism [7]. Some biological products are inert (for example, acellular dermatologic fillers [8]) and can be classified as devices. This covers devices like implanted cardiac defibrillators

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2024) 14(3), 603-610 | ISSN:2251-6727

for potentially fatal arrhythmias, implantable deep brain stimulation systems for Parkinson's disease, arthritic knee replacements, and coil embolization methods for intracranial aneurysms. However, neither the manufacturer nor the customer can afford these miracles of modern medicine. Firms must invest a substantial amount of money in new technology development through R&D, manufacturing, and marketing costs, as well as through the rigorous FDA approval process. For individuals who are committed to using cutting edge technologies to advance medicine, the cost of innovation is enormous [9]. Classification of Medical Devices and Regulatory Pathway:

Medical devices are classified as class I, II, or III in the US according to their potential risks (table). Class I devices, which include tongue depressors, sticky bandages, and hearing aids, pose the least risk to patients. Basic monitors, including as manufacturing and labelling regulations, apply to such devices. Diagnostic catheters, introducer sheaths, coronary guidewires, angioplasty balloons, and contrast auto-injection systems are a few examples of class II devices, which carry a moderate risk. Class III devices are the most dangerous and usually carry out essential to survival tasks. Medical devices classified as Class II or III must apply to the FDA for premarket notification since they carry sufficiently high risk.(Table1)

If a class II item, or a combination of gadgets that were previously subject to 510(k) regulation, has the same intended application and technological attributes, it may be submitted under 510(k). According to the code of federal rules, a 510(k) device has to prove significant equivalency to a prior approved 510(k) device in order to be approved. On the other hand, adequate assurance of a device's safety and efficacy PMA submissions are necessary for the proposed application of the product in the chosen demographic. Randomized controlled trials, one-arm studies with historical controls, and less frequently meticulously recorded case studies are examples of valid scientific evidence [10].

When a significant-risk new medical device is intended to treat a cardiovascular disease, the approval process can be drawn out and costly, usually involving a sizable multicenter prospective randomized controlled trial. Being accredited usually requires a significant financial and resource commitment and carries a high level of risk.

When designing treatments for significant unmet clinical needs that have significant market potential, such as drug-eluting stents, automated implantable cardiac defibrillators, biventricular pacing, and glucose monitors, it is easy to justify these expenditures. However, when treatments for uncommon diseases are created, it is frequently challenging, if not impossible, to get the funding required to meet the legal and regulatory standards for market release. The HUD/HDE pathway allows fewer well-characterized devices to be sold and expedites the device approval procedure [11,12]. Furthermore, an Expedited Access Pathway (EAP) to expedite FDA clearance would be available for medical devices that have the potential to meet unmet healthcare needs for potentially fatal or crippling conditions.

CLASS	RISK	CHARASTERISTICS	APPROVAL PATHWAY
I	Low	Non-life-sustaining, having a long record of safety and effectiveness.	Notification only
II	Moderate	Intended usage and protective profile are comparable to other class II devices.	510k
III	High	Life sustaining or supporting; highest risk	Premarket approval (PMA)

510k:

A 510(k) is a premarket submission to the FDA that shows the device to be sold is almost identical in terms of safety and effectiveness to a legally marketed product, according to section 513(i)(1)(A) of the Food and Drug Administration's (FD&C's) Act. Those concerned need to show that their device is significantly comparable to one or more legally permitted devices by comparing them. Devices that were lawfully available prior to May 28, 1976 (known as predicate devices), those that were moved from a greater risk (Class III) to lower-risk (Class II or I), those found to be substantially equivalent (SE)

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2024) 14(3), 603-610 | ISSN:2251-6727

through the 510(k) analyze, or those authorized for marketing via the De Novo classification procedure as per section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act and exempt from premarket notification requirements are all considered officially distributed devices. Any legitimately commercialized device may be used as a predicate, for whereas devices with recent 510(k) clearance are usually utilized to make equivalence claims. The lawfully marketed item or devices to which equivalence has been identified is referred to as the "predicate." Despite devices freshly approved via 510(k) are frequently chosen while the standard by which equivalency is claimed; however, any lawfully commercialized device perhaps employed instead. Lawfully introduced also implies that the predicate may not be in breach of the FD&C Act. The SE assessment is normally made in 90 days and depends on the submitter's data [13].

PMA:

The Foos Drug Administration's premarket approval (PMA) procedure examines the reliability and impact of Class III devices through relevance and regulatory assessment. Devices classified as Class III include those that assist or maintain human life, play a crucial role in preventing harm to the well-being of people, or provide an unacceptable danger of illness or injury. Considering to the substantial amount of danger related to Class III devices, The FDA has determined that standard safety measures and specific regulations are not suitable for ensuring their safety and effectiveness. As a result, in order to receive marketing approval, these devices must file a premarket approval (PMA) application under Section 515 of the FD&C Act. Title 21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 814, Premarket Approval of Medical Devices, contains the regulation regarding premarket approval. According to section 501(f) of the Food Drug &Cosmetic Act, a Class III devices that doesn’t comply with PMA criteria is deemed adulterated and is prohibited from being marketed [14].

DeNOVO:

The Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act, enacted by Congress in 1997, amended regulations governing medical devices issued by the FDA. This change was partly prompted by the rapid development of digital technology and its extensive use in the healthcare industry. Significantly, this law used the de novo process to identify an unfamiliar risk category for medical devices. Devices categorized as de novo are often new, less risky devices for which specific and general controls would effectively ensure safety and efficacy (class I/II). Since no device closely resembles the one in question, class III would be the default classification for these devices. Devices that receive a Category I or II classification through a De Novo classification request could be distributed and utilized as examples for future premarket notification (510k) submissions, when appropriate [15, 16]. Medical Device Recalls:

Every year, the FDA receives tens of thousands of security concerns data about malfunctions, injuries, deaths, and other adverse events connected to medical devices from producers, healthcare facilities, physicians, patients, and more[17]. Potential safety risks perhaps identified in aftermarket studies or research conducted by producers, the FDA, or third-party investigators [18]. To safeguard public health, these may result in recalls, which are measures carried out by companies or, in rare cases, by the FDA to resolve safety concerns with distributed products that violate FDA standards. Medical devices frequently malfunction, potentially causing devastating consequences for people. Recalls are a means for the FDA to remove or correct products that were manufactured in violation of laws. The FDA assigns a numeral classification (I, II, or III) to recalls based on the proportional amount of danger to health posed by the recalled device.

• Class I: a circumstance where there is a plausible chance that using or being in proximity to an item that exceeds the law would result in severe health implications or even fatality.

• Class II: when using or being exposed to a offensive device could result in abrupt, undesirable but potentially curable adverse health impacts, or when there is low likelihood of significant adverse health impacts.

• Class III: An instance where there is a low likelihood of harm to one's health by utilizing or being subjected to a forbidden product [19].

• Market withdrawal: A device is deemed ideally in the "market withdrawal" status if there is barely anything infringement that is unlikely lead to a lawsuit by the FDA.

Medical device safety alert: issued in cases where there is a plausible risk that a medical equipment would cause

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 603-610 | ISSN:2251-6727

serious injury. These incidents may also be considered recalls under certain conditions. It is not always necessary to discontinue using a medical device or return it to the manufacturer in the event of a recall. Recalls can indicate when a medical device needs to be inspected, calibrated, or repaired. Manufacturers frequently advise doctors to get in touch with their patients to discuss the risks of having an implanted device removed versus leaving it in place when there is a chance that it will fail accidentally. Examples of various types of activities that could be classified as recalls:

- Testing the gadget for issues
- Fixing the device.
- Modifying the device's parameters.
- Renaming the device.
- Destroying device
- Alerting patients to an issue
- Keeping an eye out for health problems among patients

Occasionally, an organization perhaps conscious that an issue exists with a class of items, but it is unable to identify which specific devices would be impacted. In order to resolve the issue, the manufacturer might recall a whole lot, model, or range of products. The FDA notifies the Medical Device Recall Database of any correction or removal actions that an organization has taken. The FDA maintains the Medical Device Recall Database after classifying the recall and again once it is terminated [20].

Reasones of Device Recall:

Defective Design:

Medical devices may be recalled if they have design flaws that pose a risk to patient safety or if they fail to meet the FDA's design criteria. Design defects can be identified through various means, including post-market surveillance, adverse event reports, clinical studies, and manufacturer-initiated evaluations. These defects may include issues such as inadequate product performance, incorrect functionality, or design-related safety concerns [21].

Manufacturing Defects:

If a medical device has manufacturing defects that affect its safety and performance, it may be recalled. The process usually begins when the manufacturer becomes aware of or is made aware of a defect or problem in the manufacturing process that results in a medical device not meeting its intended specifications or poses a safety risk [22].

Lebling and Packaging defect:

Recalls can occur due to problems with labelling, packaging, or instructions for use. The issue related to mislabeling such as incorrect instructions for use, misleading claims, or incorrect indications for use, it can lead to patient harm. Or if a device's labelling fails to include necessary warnings or contraindications, it can pose a safety risk. the instructions for using the device are unclear or insufficient, it can lead to improper use, potentially harming patients such labelling defects may occurs [23]. Packaging defects can compromise the sterility of a device. If a device is supposed to be sterile, any breach in the packaging can lead to contamination and infection risk. Damage to the packaging can result in physical damage to the device itself, affecting its functionality or sterility [24].

Software Defects:

One of the primary causes of recalls is malfunctioning software. In reality, one out of every three medical devices that utilize software to operate have been recalled due to software failures. Software recalls encompass a wide range of software types used in various aspects of medical device development, production, and operation. This includes software integral to the functioning of medical devices (like software as a medical device), off-the-shelf software or supporting software used in device development, electronic design automation tools and the documents they generate, software used in verification and validation processes, production tools, as well as software components integrated into specific parts of a device. Essentially, any software element involved in the lifecycle of a medical device that requires correction or removal due to safety or performance issues may be subject to recall [25]. For example, on April 7,21, the Nitric Oxide Delivery System experienced failures in nitric oxide delivery due to a software malfunction. Usually, this problem resulted in the administration of a

Journal of Chemical Health Risks
www.jchr.org
JCHR (2024) 14(3), 603-610 | ISSN:2251-6727

nitric oxide dosage that was lower than anticipated while switching between the primary and backup provides [26]. Due to the possibility that repeated upstream occlusion incidents won't trigger an alarm, SIGMA Spectrum Infusion Pumps with Master Drug Library (Version 8) and Spectrum IQ Infusion Systems with Dose IQ Safety Software (Version 9) are recommended. Failure to thoroughly resolve any upstream obstruction before restarting the infusion can cause the pump to fail to re-alarm as expected [27]. Defect mitigation is a primary consideration in the creation of medical devices such as infusion pumps and ventilators, as well as in health information technology systems such as electronic health records. User interface software issues may potentially be the cause of a medical devices recall [28].

FDA Regulation and Enforcement:

The FDA regulates medical device recalls based on Title 21 Part 806 of the Federal Code of Regulations, as published in the Federal Register. Organizations can notify recalls of on-market products promptly under 21 CFR Part 806 (Medical Devices; Corrections and Removals). The regulation covers remedial actions, market withdrawals, normal servicing, and stock recovery, as outlined by the FDA (2018). The FDA requires manufacturers and importers to provide written reports for any device corrections or removals initiated by them (FDA, 2018). This action is conducted for two reasons: 1) to notify the FDA of a potential safety danger for consumers, and 2) to allow the firm to correct or remove the nonconformity that poses a health risk to patients. The regulation specifies the information needed for the report, such as:

• Manufacturer information;

• Product brand and classification;

• Marketing status;

• Unique Device Identifier;

• Description of event;

• Reporting of any known illnesses or adverse reactions related to device use [29].

Voluntary Recalls:

Device enhancements may prompt voluntary recalls initiated by either the OEM or FDA as outlined in 21 CFR § 7, Subpart C, or 21 CFR § 7(C). Voluntary recalls, per 21 CFR § 7.3(h), 21 CFR § 806.2(j), and/or 21 CFR § Part 806, encompass functional modifications and quality performance improvements. These recalls may involve correction actions, including on-site software modifications, or offsite removal for repairs/services if preventive maintenance is insufficient. Additionally, activities like stock recovery (unreleased products failing quality inspection) and market withdrawal (OEM correction of minor violations) are considered enhancements. Safety alerts, notifying users of potential harm, are also voluntary actions not violating federal law (FDA, 2014a,b).

Mandatory Recalls:

A mandatory recall, mandated by the FDA under FD&C Act Sec 518(e) and 21 CFR Part 810.13, is triggered by violations ranging from minor infractions to severe cases resulting in patient harm or death. Non-compliance with federal laws, including the FD&C Act and FDA Quality System Regulations (QSR) 21 CFR § 820, necessitates corrective measures for legal adherence, prioritizing patient safety and product performance. Device failure, indicated by falling below quality standards or failing to meet intended use specifications, is a common reason for mandatory recalls. For instance, if an implanted device's reported battery life is 5 years, but malfunctions occur earlier, it may be deemed adulterated or potentially misbranded under relevant sections of the FD&C Act. Mandatory recalls involve rigorous tracking of device failures through adverse event reporting and formal investigations to meet regulatory requirements for both end users and OEMs.

Medical Device Reporting and Investigations:

Reporting malfunctions or nonconformance of medical devices is crucial for both manufacturers and user facilities, with regulations outlined in 21 CFR § 820.198. Manufacturers must have robust internal reporting mechanisms for handling complaints, conducting failure mode analysis, and implementing corrective and preventive actions (CAPA) under 21 CFR § 803 Medical Device Reporting. The regulations distinguish reporting guidelines for device user facilities, importers, and manufacturers, each outlined in Subparts C, D, and E of 21 CFR § 803, respectively.

During a recall, original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) play a vital role by promptly responding to

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 603-610 | ISSN:2251-6727

reports of potential hazards within 10 working days. Detailed reports, including product information, risk evaluation, and recall strategy, must be submitted to the FDA. The reporting timelines vary, with OEMs reporting incidents within 30 days, importers notifying OEMs and the FDA, and device user facilities reporting mortality cases to both the OEM and the FDA. Manufacturers, facilities using medical devices, and importers are required by law to report any incidents involving medical devices. On the other hand, clinicians, patients, and caregivers are encouraged to share any issues they encounter with medical devices, although it's not mandatory for them to do so. The Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) database acts as a central hub where both mandatory and voluntary reports are collected. This allows for a thorough and continuous examination of medical device problems throughout the entire supply chain, aiding in identifying trends and addressing safety concerns effectively [30].

Subpart A, General Provission	
General Terminology	21 CFR § 803.3
Public Disclosure	21 CFR § 803.9
Applicable Reporting Requirements	21 CFR § 803.10
Obtaining Forms	21 CFR § 803.11
Who Receives the Form?	21 CFR § 803.12
Electronic Submissions	21 CFR § 803.14
Applicable Reporting Procedures	21 CFR § 803.17
Records Maintenance	21 CFR § 803.18
Reporting Exemptions	21 CFR § 803.19

Subpart B, General Individual Adverse Event Reporting	
Instructions to Complete Report	21 CFR § 803.20
Reporting Codes	21 CFR § 803.21
Understanding Who Reports and Under What Conditions	21 CFR § 803.22

510k and PMA Recalls:

While the 510(k) process facilitates a quicker route to market for many devices, it has faced criticism due to instances where devices cleared through this pathway have been recalled for serious safety concerns. Studies have indicated that a majority of medical devices recalled for life-threatening risks were initially cleared through the 510(k) process.

The Institute of Medicine (IOM) was tasked by the FDA to assess the 510(k) process. The IOM determined that the procedure was fundamentally faulty and lacked the necessary lawful foundation to ensure the safety and efficacy of moderate-risk devices. They recommended replacing the 510(k) process entirely. However, the FDA disagreed with the IOM's conclusions, stating that while improvements were needed, the 510(k) process still had merit. The device industry also had mixed opinions, with some advocating for maintaining the current system and others suggesting reforms to the 510(k) process instead of its complete elimination [31,32].

Conclusion:

The study has provided a comprehensive understanding of the medical device recall process in the United States, including its significance in ensuring the safety and effectiveness of medical devices on the market. Also examine the FDA's role as a regulatory authority and how it utilizes the recall system as a vital mechanism for identifying and addressing issues related to medical devices that may pose risks to patients or fail to meet regulatory standards. Outline the different classes of recalls and the reasons behind medical device recalls, which may include violations of regulations or the identification of potential health hazards. Also explore and analyse the frequency of recalls for medical devices approved through the 510(k) premarket notification process compared to those approved through the Pre-Market Approval (PMA) process.

References

1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. History. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/overview-device-regulation/history-medical-device-regulation-oversight-united-states
2. Federal Food Drug and Cosmetics Act P.L. 75- 717, 1938, x505(c) and (d).
3. Fargen KM, Frei D, Fiorella D, McDougall CG, Myers PM, Hirsch JA, Mocco J. The FDA approval process for medical devices: an inherently flawed system or a valuable pathway for innovation? Journal of neurointerventional surgery. 2013 Jul 1;5(4):269-75..

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 603-610 | ISSN:2251-6727

4. Gieringer DH. The safety and efficacy of new drug approval. Cato J.. 1985;5:177.
5. https://usiraq.procon.org/sourcefiles/FEDERAL_FOOD_AND_DRUGS_ACT_1906.pdf
6. Federal Food Drug and Cosmetics Act 21 U.S.C. 321(h)
7. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Classification of Products as Drugs and Devices and Additional Product Classification Issues. Available at: Regulatory Information | FDA.
8. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Soft Tissue Fillers (Dermal Fillers). Available at https://www.fda.gov/medicaldevices/aestheticcosmetic-devices/dermal-fillers-soft-tissue-fillers
9. Fargen KM, Frei D, Fiorella D, McDougall CG, Myers PM, Hirsch JA, Mocco J. The FDA approval process for medical devices: an inherently flawed system or a valuable pathway for innovation?. Journal of neurointerventional surgery. 2013 Jul 1;5(4):269-75.
10. Sastry A. Overview of the US FDA medical device approval process. Current cardiology reports. 2014 Jun;16:1-5.
11. Kaplan AV, Harvey ED, Kuntz RE, Shiran H, Robb JF, Fitzgerald P. Humanitarian use devices/humanitarian device exemptions in cardiovascular medicine. Circulation. 2005 Nov 1;112(18):2883-6.
12. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/premarket-submissions-selecting-and-preparing-correct-submission/humanitarian-device-exemption
13. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/premarket-submissions-selecting-and-preparing-correct-submission/premarket-notification-510k
14. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/premarket-submissions-selecting-and-preparing-correct-submission/premarket-approval-pma#when
15. Additionally, medical devices with the potential to address unmet healthcare needs for debilitating or life-threatening diseases would be eligible for an Expedited Access Pathway (EAP) to facilitate FDA clearance.
16. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/premarket-submissions-selecting-and-preparing-correct-submission/de-novo-classification-request
17. .Food Drug Administration MDR Data Files Available at: MDR Data Files | FDA
18. Tau N, Shepshelovich D. Assessment of data sources that support US food and drug administration medical devices safety communications. JAMA internal medicine. 2020 Nov 1;180(11):1420-6.
19. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/postmarket-requirements-devices/recalls-corrections-and-removals-devices#4
20. What is medical device recall? Available at : https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/medical-device-recalls/what-medical-device-recall .
21. [21].21CFR Part 820 Quality System Regulation Subpart C. Sec820.30 Design Controls Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfcfr/cfrsearch.cfm?fr=820.30
22. 21CFR Part 820 Quality System Regulation Subpart I Sec. 820.90 Nonconforming product Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfcfr/cfrsearch.cfm?fr=820.90
23. .21 CFR Part 801 labelling https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-H/part-801
24. 21CFR Part 820 Quality System Regulation Subpart K Labelling and Packaging Control Sec.820.130 device Packaging Available at : https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfcfr/CFRSearch.cfm?fr=820.130
25. Simone LK. Software-related recalls: an analysis of records. Biomedical instrumentation & technology. 2013 Dec;47(6):514-22.
26. Vero Biotech Recalls GENOSYL DS; Nitric Oxide Delivery System Due to Software Error Available at: https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/medical-device-recalls/vero-biotech-recalls-genosyl-ds-nitric-oxide-delivery-system-due-software-error
27. Baxter recalls SIGMA Spectrum Infusion Pumps with Master Drug Library (Version 8) and Spectrum IQ Infusion Systems with Dose IQ Safety Software (Version 9) due to the risk of not alarming for repeated upstream occlusion events. Available at : https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/medical-device-recalls/baxter-recalls-sigma-spectrum-infusion-pumps-master-drug-library-version-8-and-spectrum-iq-infusion
28. Zhang Y, Masci P, Jones P, Thimbleby H. User interface software errors in medical devices: study of US recall data. Biomedical Instrumentation & Technology. 2019 May;53(3):182-94.

29. Pace T. ANALYSIS OF FDA MEDICAL DEVICE RECALLS TIME BETWEEN RECALL INITATION DATE AND TERMINATION DATE _ A Thesis Presented (Doctoral dissertation, California State University, Dominguez Hills).
30. [30] Fiedler BA. Device failure tracking and response to manufacturing recalls. InManaging Medical Devices Within a Regulatory Framework 2017 Jan 1 (pp. 263-275). Elsevier.
31. Zuckerman DM, Brown P, Nissen SE. Medical device recalls and the FDA approval process. Archives of internal medicine. 2011 Jun 13;171(11):1006-11.
32. Somberg JC, McEwen P, Molnar J. Assessment of cardiovascular and noncardiovascular medical device recalls. The American Journal of Cardiology. 2014 Jun 1;113(11):1899-903.