IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Navigating The Evolving Regulatory Landscape Of Software As A Medical Device (Samd)

Jinit Patel

Student, Northeastern University, Toronto, Canada

Introduction

The healthcare landscape is undergoing a significant transformation due to the integration of ad- vanced technologies, particularly Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML). (Forum, 2013) Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) is at the forefront of this evolution, which offers promising advancements in medical diagnosis, treatment, and management. However, with these innovations come considerable ethical and legal considerations that warrant thorough regulatory oversight.

Patient safety is of utmost importance as SaMD increasingly participates in clinical decision- making processes. Furthermore, it is essential to safeguard data privacy and ensure algorithmic transparency and accountability. (Blenkinsopp & Frost, 2020) Establishing effective regulatory frameworks is critical to balancing the promotion of innovation with the protection of patient wel- fare. By providing clear guidelines and standards for the development, validation, and post-market surveillance of SaMD, policymakers can inspire confidence in the safety and effectiveness of these technologies. (Forum, 2014)

This paper aims to examine the ethical and legal implications surrounding SaMD regulation, with a focus on vital issues such as patient safety, data privacy, and algorithmic accountabil- ity. Through an analysis of existing regulatory frameworks and the identification of emerging best practices, this work seeks to provide valuable insights and recommendations for stakehold- ers throughout the healthcare ecosystem. By collaboratively addressing these challenges, we can harness the transformative potential of SaMD while upholding ethical standards and ensuring a patient-centered approach to care.

Keywords

Software as a Medical Device (SaMD), Regulatory Frameworks, Ethical Considerations, Legal Implications, Patient Safety, Data Privacy, Algorithmic Accountability

The Rise of SaMD: Redefining Healthcare Delivery

Software as a Medical Device (SaMD), as defined by the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF), refers to software that is intended for medical purposes but is not part of a hardware medical device. These advanced software solutions utilize artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) algorithms to analyze extensive amounts of patient data, medical images, and clinical records. This analysis provides healthcare professionals with valuable insights and recommendations for diagnosis, treatment, and disease management. (Research & Markets, 2021) The potential benefits of SaMD are significant, including improved diagnostic accuracy, per- sonalized treatment plans, and enhanced patient outcomes. By harnessing the power of AI and ML, SaMD has the potential to transform healthcare delivery, offering tailored solutions that are both efficient and effective. (Hermon & Williams, 2021)

However, the rapid adoption of SaMD has raised concerns regarding ethical and legal impli- cations. This has prompted regulatory bodies to reassess their oversight frameworks. Issues sur- rounding patient privacy, data security, and algorithmic bias have become increasingly prominent, highlighting the need for comprehensive regulatory oversight to ensure the responsible develop- ment and deployment of SaMD solutions.

In response to these challenges, regulatory authorities are actively working to establish clear guidelines and standards for the development, validation, and post-market surveillance of SaMD. By addressing these concerns proactively, policymakers aim to foster innovation while protecting patient welfare and upholding ethical principles in healthcare delivery.

Ethical Considerations: Ensuring Patient Safety and Trust Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

A significant ethical concern in the deployment of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) is the potential for algorithmic bias. AI and machine learning (ML) models, which are often foundational to many SaMD applications, are typically trained on large datasets that may inadvertently reflect societal biases or lack

demographic diversity. (Panch et al., 2019) Consequently, these algorithms may produce outputs that are inaccurate or discriminatory, particularly when applied to patient populations underrepresented in the training data. This is especially problematic in healthcare, where biased algorithms can lead to misdiagnoses or inappropriate treatment recommendations for patients from minority or underserved groups, consequently exacerbating existing health dispari- ties.

To address these concerns, regulatory bodies such as the FDA and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) emphasize the importance of utilizing diverse and representative training datasets in the development of SaMD. (Obermeyer et al., 2019) These agencies recommend that developers conduct extensive testing and validation to ensure that algorithms perform equitably across vari- ous demographic groups. Moreover, there is a growing call for transparency in the development process, with stakeholders advocating for clear and rigorous reporting on data sources, algorithmic models, and performance metrics. Such measures not only help identify and mitigate bias but also enable greater scrutiny and accountability in the deployment of AI-based medical technologies. (Chen et al., 2020)

Informed Consent and Patient Autonomy

Another cornerstone of ethical practice in SaMD is ensuring that patients maintain autonomy over their healthcare decisions, which necessitates robust informed consent processes. As SaMD be- comes increasingly integrated into clinical decision-making, patients must receive clear and com- prehensive information regarding how these technologies will be utilized in their care. Informed consent in this context goes beyond simply disclosing potential risks; it involves ensuring that pa- tients understand the role of SaMD in their treatment, the potential benefits and limitations, and the implications of algorithmic decision-making in their healthcare journey. (Cohen & Mello, 2020)

Regulatory frameworks must evolve to ensure that patients are not only informed but also em- powered to make decisions about their treatment options. This includes establishing clear guide- lines for communicating the risks associated with SaMD and ensuring that patients can opt out of SaMD-guided care without compromising the overall quality of their healthcare experience. A key ethical challenge is striking a balance between leveraging the advantages of SaMD—for instance, improved diagnostic accuracy and personalized treatment plans—and respecting patient autonomy. (Gerke et al., 2020) It is essential to ensure that patients can choose whether or not to engage with SaMD-based interventions while still receiving appropriate care, and upholding their rights and dignity.

Transparency and Explainability

The ”black box” nature of many AI and ML algorithms used in SaMD presents significant chal- lenges related to transparency and explainability. (Duran & Jongsma, 2021) These algorithms often operate in ways that are not easily understandable to healthcare professionals, let alone patients. The lack of interpretability can hinder healthcare providers' ability to trust or fully understand the recommendations generated by these systems, which may lead to reluctance in their adoption or improper use. Furthermore, patients may feel uneasy about decisions made by systems they do not understand, leading to diminished trust in the technology and, potentially, in the healthcare providers who use it.

To address these challenges, regulatory bodies have called for greater transparency in the devel- opment of SaMD, particularly concerning the decision-making processes of the algorithms. (Lon- don, 2019)Developers are encouraged to ensure that their algorithms are interpretable, meaning that the rationale behind the system's recommendations can be clearly understood and communi- cated. This transparency is crucial for fostering trust among both patients and healthcare providers and ensuring that SaMD applications are used appropriately. Additionally, regulatory agencies advocate for mechanisms that allow for the auditing of these systems, ensuring that they operate in accordance with established standards of safety and efficacy. The ability to audit and explain decisions made by AI-based systems is essential not only for regulatory compliance but also for enabling healthcare professionals to make informed, evidence-based decisions when incorporating SaMD into their clinical practice. (Rajkomar et al., 2018)

Harmonizing Global Regulatory Frameworks

The rapid advancement of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) technology has created a need for comprehensive and standardized regulatory frameworks worldwide. As the adoption of SaMD continues to increase, regulatory agencies in various regions recognize the importance of hav- ing harmonized approval processes that not only streamline market access but also ensure patient safety. To tackle these challenges, initiatives like the International Medical Device Regulators Fo- rum (IMDRF) have been established to promote alignment and consistency in the regulation of SaMD. (Food & Administration, 2021) These efforts aim to ensure that products meet rigorous safety and performance standards while facilitating faster market entry.

Role of IMDRF in Harmonizing Global Regulations

The IMDRF has become a key player in fostering international collaboration among regulatory agencies, providing a platform for harmonizing software as a medical device (SaMD) regulations. Through these initiatives, the IMDRF aims to reduce regulatory fragmentation by aligning risk classification, compliance requirements, and post-market surveillance practices. This harmoniza- tion ensures that SaMD products are evaluated consistently and classified appropriately based on their potential impact on patient health.

Additionally, aligning post-market monitoring helps guarantee the ongoing safety and perfor- mance of SaMD products after they are introduced into healthcare systems, allowing for the timely identification of any potential issues. However, discrepancies still exist between the regulatory frameworks of major markets, complicating the approval process for manufacturers seeking access to global markets. (Food & Administration, 2021)

Key Regulatory Approaches Across Major Markets

United States (FDA)

In the United States, software as a medical device (SaMD) is primarily regulated by the FDA, which follows the Digital Health Innovation Action Plan. The FDA uses a risk-based approach to determine the level of regulatory oversight needed for different devices. (Food & Administration, 2017) There are three main approval pathways offered by the FDA:

1. **510(k) Clearance**: This pathway is for class II medical devices that are substantially equiv- alent to existing devices.
2. **De Novo Classification**: This is for novel devices that are classified as low or moderate risk.
3. **Premarket Approval (PMA)**: This is required for high-risk devices that need extensive clinical testing.

The FDA's flexible approach allows manufacturers to choose the most appropriate pathway based on the device's risk level. High-risk devices, particularly those that directly impact patients, must undergo rigorous clinical testing and provide substantial evidence of their safety and efficacy. Furthermore, the FDA supports ongoing monitoring of SaMD performance using real-world evi- dence, allowing for updates and modifications to devices without needing complete re-approval, provided that the associated risks are effectively managed. (U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2018)

European Union (MDR/IVDR

The European Union (EU) adopts a more stringent regulatory approach governed by the Medi- cal Device Regulation (MDR) and the In Vitro Diagnostic Regulation (IVDR). These regulations impose comprehensive requirements for clinical validation and post-market surveillance before a Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) product can receive the CE marking, which indicates regulatory compliance in the EU. (Commission, 2017)

In contrast to the FDA, the EU mandates more extensive clinical evidence to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of SaMD products, particularly for higher-risk devices. For medium- and high- risk devices, the EU requires assessments by Notified Bodies, which can significantly extend the approval timeline. These additional assessments ensure that products meet rigorous safety and performance standards before they can be marketed. (Kramer et al., 2012)

Canada (Health Canada)

Health Canada's regulatory framework is similar to that of the FDA, but it includes unique elements specific to the Canadian healthcare system. SaMD in Canada is regulated under a four-tier risk classification system, where higher-risk devices (Class III and IV) necessitate a Medical Device License (MDL). (Canada, 2019) Like the FDA and EU, Health Canada mandates compliance with ISO 13485, which is the globally recognized standard for medical device quality management systems. This compliance ensures that manufacturers follow rigorous quality control practices throughout the product lifecycle.

While Health Canada's regulations generally align with those of the FDA and the EU, the specifics of its approval process and regional nuances highlight the need for manufacturers to understand the particular requirements in each jurisdiction.

Addressing Regulatory Fragmentation: The Role of MDSAP

Given the differences in regulatory approaches across various markets, manufacturers face signifi- cant challenges in navigating the approval processes for SaMD. To address this issue, the Medical Device Single Audit Program (MDSAP) was introduced as a means to streamline compliance across multiple regions.

MDSAP allows manufacturers to undergo a single audit recognized by regulatory authorities in several countries, including the United States (FDA), Canada (Health Canada), Brazil (ANVISA), Japan (PMDA), and

Australia (TGA). This program helps reduce redundant audits, making it easier for manufacturers to demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements across multiple juris-dictions simultaneously. By facilitating a single audit process, MDSAP not only expedites market entry for SaMD products but also ensures that global safety standards are consistently met. (Forum, n.d.)

Post-Market Surveillance and Adaptive Regulatory Models in Medical Device Oversight

The traditional framework for regulatory approval primarily concentrates on pre-market assess- ments, ensuring that medical devices adhere to established safety and efficacy standards before launch. However, the advent of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) presents unique challenges due to its inherent ability to evolve continuously through software updates and adaptive algorithms, particularly those driven by artificial intelligence (AI). Given the dynamic nature of SaMD, regula- tory bodies are shifting their oversight strategies towards an adaptive model that prioritizes patient safety and product efficacy throughout the entire product lifecycle rather than solely at the point of initial approval. This transformation is fostering the development of adaptive regulatory frame- works that emphasize ongoing monitoring and real-time adjustments informed by emerging data. (U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2021)

Total Product Lifecycle (TPLC) Approach

The Total Product Lifecycle (TPLC) approach, as adopted by the U.S. Food and Drug Administra- tion (FDA), signifies a critical transition to adaptive regulatory models. This approach reframes the perspective on medical devices from static products requiring reapproval after initial clearance to dynamic solutions necessitating continuous evaluation, from development through post-market de- ployment. The TPLC model acknowledges that ongoing updates and enhancements—particularly those fueled by AI and machine learning—are vital for sustaining the safety and effectiveness of SaMD over time.

Key Components of the TPLC Model

1. **Integration of Real-World Evidence (RWE):** A cornerstone of the TPLC framework is the incorporation of real-world evidence (RWE) into the regulatory process. RWE, collected from hospitals, healthcare providers, and patient records, generates a consistent flow of feed- back that enables regulators to monitor the performance of SaMD in actual clinical settings. This evidence base is critical for assessing the ongoing safety and efficacy of these products, subsequently informing necessary updates or regulatory actions.

2. **Periodic Algorithmic Updates:** In contrast to traditional medical devices, SaMD solu- tions—particularly those featuring AI—are subject to regular algorithmic updates designed to enhance functionality or cater to evolving medical needs. Under the TPLC model, such updates can occur frequently without necessitating reapproval, provided they meet speci- fied safety and performance criteria. This flexibility ensures that SaMD products remain responsive to patient needs while adhering to regulatory standards.

3. **Post-Market Performance Monitoring:** The TPLC approach mandates rigorous post-market performance monitoring. Manufacturers are required to report any software malfunctions, adverse patient outcomes, or unexpected behaviors associated with SaMD once these prod- ucts are in use. This compulsory reporting mechanism keeps regulators informed of any emerging issues, facilitating swift corrective actions. Additionally, regular performance re- views enable the regulatory framework to adapt based on real-time market data.

FDA's SaMD Pre Certification Pilot Program

Complementing the TPLC model, the FDA has initiated the SaMD Pre-certification Pilot Program, which offers an alternative regulatory framework aimed at expediting the approval process for manufacturers with strong compliance histories. This program shifts the focus from individual products to a comprehensive evaluation of the company's quality management systems, regulatory track record, and commitment to safety, allowing manufacturers to obtain "pre-certified" status for expedited approval of new products and updates. (Breglio & Ryan, 2021) This evolving regulatory landscape represents a proactive approach to ensuring that SaMD products not only meet initial compliance standards but continue to deliver safe and effective healthcare solutions throughout their lifecycle.

Key Features of the Pre-certification Program

1. **Streamlined Approvals for Compliant Manufacturers:** Manufacturers demonstrating ro- bust compliance with FDA regulations benefit from expedited approval processes for new SaMD products. This streamlined mechanism reduces the time required for these companies to introduce innovative solutions to the market while upholding rigorous safety standards.

2. **Robust Post-Market Tracking Mechanisms:** The pre-certification program incorporates comprehensive post-market tracking strategies that facilitate continuous monitoring of SaMD performance in real-world conditions. As manufacturers adapt their products in response to market feedback, these tracking mechanisms ensure that

any identified issues post-launch are addressed promptly and effectively.

3. **Accelerated Time-to-Market for Iterative Software Improvements:** Given the rapid it- erations typical of SaMD solutions, the Precertification Pilot Program offers a structured framework that allows these enhancements to reach the market swiftly. By emphasizing the quality management systems of manufacturers, the program accelerates the approval process for updates and modifications that enhance SaMD product performance.

Legal Implications: Navigating Regulatory Frameworks The Role of Regulatory Bodies

Regulatory bodies, such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), play a crucial role in overseeing the development, validation, and deployment of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD).

These agencies are responsible for ensuring that SaMD complies with strict safety and efficacy standards while also addressing legal considerations such as data privacy, intellectual property rights, and liability. (Forum, 2014)

The FDA has adopted a risk-based approach to regulating SaMD, meaning that higher-risk de- vices undergo more rigorous premarket review processes. Additionally, the agency has proposed a regulatory framework specifically designed for SaMD that incorporates adaptive learning capabil- ities, recognizing the unique challenges posed by these rapidly evolving technologies.

Data Privacy and Security

The utilization of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) often involves processing and analyzing sensitive patient information, including electronic health records, medical imaging, and personal data. This situation raises significant legal and ethical concerns regarding data privacy and secu- rity. (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2021)The mishandling or unauthorized disclosure of such information can have severe consequences for patients. Therefore, regulatory frameworks must be established to address these concerns by implementing strong data protec- tion measures, including encryption, access controls, and comprehensive data governance policies. Moreover, there is a pressing need for clear guidelines concerning data ownership, patient con- sent, and the responsible sharing of patient information for SaMD development and validation. (European Union Agency for Cybersecurity, 2019)

The Significance of Regulatory Frameworks

The importance of regulatory frameworks cannot be overstated, particularly given the sensitivity of the information involved in SaMD. These frameworks must ensure robust data protection mea- sures to prevent mishandling or unauthorized disclosure of patient information, which can lead to significant ramifications. Clear guidelines on data ownership, patient consent, and responsible sharing of information for SaMD development and validation are essential.

Intellectual Property and Licensing Considerations

The development of SaMD is often accompanied by significant intellectual property (IP) consider- ations, which may include patents, copyrights, and trade secrets.(World Intellectual Property Orga- nization, 2020) Regulatory authorities must provide clear guidance on IP protection and licensing frameworks to incentivize innovation while fostering fair competition and access to essential tech- nologies. Moreover, the management of SaMD may require complex licensing agreements among healthcare providers, technology companies, and other stakeholders. Regulatory oversight is nec- essary to ensure that these agreements are transparent, equitable, and aligned with the best interests of patients and public health.(Garzo & Garay-Vitoria, 2021)

Liability and Risk Management

As SaMD becomes increasingly integrated into healthcare decision-making processes, issues re- garding liability and risk management become critically important. In cases where adverse patient outcomes or errors arise from the use of SaMD, it is vital to establish clear lines of responsibil- ity and accountability among the involved parties. (Oriel STAT A MATRIX, 2021) Regulatory frameworks must specify the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders, including SaMD developers, healthcare providers, and regulatory bodies. Additionally, robust risk management strategies—such as post-market surveillance, adverse event reporting, and ongoing monitoring of SaMD performance—are paramount. (Food & Administration, 2019)

Fostering Collaboration and Harmonization

The ethical and legal implications surrounding SaMD regulation are complex and multifaceted, ne- cessitating a collaborative approach among various stakeholders, including regulatory authorities, healthcare providers, technology firms, patient advocacy organizations, and legal experts. A criti- cal component of this collaboration is the harmonization of regulatory frameworks across different jurisdictions. Given that SaMD operates across geographical boundaries, a lack of harmonization

can lead to fragmented and inconsistent standards, impeding innovation and potentially compro- mising patient safety. Initiatives like the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF) and the Global Harmonization Task Force (GHTF) play an instrumental role in establishing inter- national standards and best practices for SaMD regulation. (Global Harmonization Task Force, 2012)

Future Outlook: The Convergence of Technology and Regulation

As technological innovations continue to evolve at a rapid pace, particularly within the realm of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD), regulatory bodies face the formidable challenge of keeping abreast of these advancements. The need for adaptive and agile regulatory frameworks has become increasingly critical as pioneering technologies—including blockchain, quantum computing, and federated learning—transform healthcare delivery. While these innovations have the potential to significantly enhance SaMD products and revolutionize patient care, they simultaneously introduce complexities that regulators must address to ensure both patient safety and the integrity of data. (Larkin & Mohan, 2021)

Blockchain for Data Integrity

Among the most promising technologies poised to revolutionize healthcare is blockchain. Orig- inally popularized by cryptocurrencies, blockchain technology provides a decentralized and im- mutable ledger, which can ensure the integrity and traceability of data. In the context of SaMD and healthcare, blockchain holds substantial promise for enhancing the integrity of patient records and software logs, thereby addressing critical concerns regarding data security and auditability. (Larkin & Mohan, 2021)

Blockchain's Role in SaMD

Blockchain technology can effectively tackle several key challenges in SaMD, including:

- **Immutable Patient Records:** The decentralized nature of blockchain guarantees that patient data cannot be altered once entered into the system, thereby offering a transparent and secure mechanism for maintaining electronic health records (EHRs). This aspect is particularly vital for SaMD, as it is imperative to preserve patient outcomes and other critical data related to device performance in a secure and unchangeable manner. By leveraging blockchain, regulators can ensure that SaMD manufacturers do not tamper with or manipulate patient data inappropriately. (Mehta & Gupta, 2020)

- **Software Logs and Audit Trails:** The immutability of blockchain extends to software logs that document interactions with SaMD. This capability ensures that any updates, modifica- tions, or issues encountered with the device are permanently recorded in an auditable format. This is especially pertinent for AI-driven SaMD solutions that undergo frequent algorithmic updates, as regulatory bodies need to track the evolution of the software over time to evaluate its impact on patient safety and device efficacy. (Mehta & Gupta, 2020)

- **Patient Consent and Data Privacy:** Blockchain can facilitate the management of patient consent and data privacy securely and transparently. By empowering patients to control access to their health data, blockchain has the potential to foster greater trust in SaMD prod- ucts while ensuring compliance with rigorous privacy regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in Europe. (Mehta & Gupta, 2020)

Regulatory Implications of Blockchain

For regulatory authorities, the challenge lies in developing clear guidelines for integrating blockchain technology into the approval process for SaMD. This may encompass addressing issues related to the interoperability of blockchain with existing health information systems, ensuring compliance with data protection laws, and establishing standards for the secure implementation of blockchain in medical devices. Furthermore, regulatory agencies will need to evaluate whether blockchain can streamline reporting and surveillance processes, thereby ensuring transparency and accountability

for manufacturers throughout the product lifecycle.

Quantum Computing in Healthcare AI

Quantum computing stands as another groundbreaking technology with transformative potential for the healthcare sector, including SaMD. Quantum computers utilize principles of quantum me- chanics to perform calculations that would be unfeasible for classical computers to achieve within a reasonable timeframe. In the field of artificial intelligence, quantum computing could substantially enhance processing capabilities, leading to more accurate and efficient machine-learning models for real-time medical diagnoses and personalized treatment recommendations. (Brown, 2020)

Quantum Computing and AI in SaMD

- **Enhanced Processing Power:** Quantum computers could deliver the computational power essential for processing vast amounts of healthcare data with unprecedented speed and ac- curacy. This capability is particularly crucial for real-time applications, such as diagnostic tools and clinical decision support systems, where timely, data-driven decisions may have life-saving implications. For instance, SaMD designed to assist in the diagnosis of complex conditions—such as cancer or neurological disorders—could greatly benefit from quantum- powered AI algorithms capable of analyzing imaging data with extraordinary rapidity and precision. (Brown, 2020)

- **Improved Personalization of Treatment:** Quantum computing may enable the develop- ment of advanced AI models that account for a patient's unique genetic profile, medical history, and lifestyle factors, thereby providing highly personalized treatment recommenda- tions. The ability to process large-scale, multifactorial datasets could significantly enhance treatment outcomes and patient satisfaction.

Conclusion

The integration of SaMD into healthcare systems represents a significant paradigm shift, offering unprecedented opportunities for enhanced patient outcomes, personalized treatment, and improved healthcare delivery. However, this transformation also introduces considerable ethical and legal challenges, warranting comprehensive regulatory oversight.

Regulatory bodies are tasked with navigating this intricate landscape, striving to balance the promotion of innovation with the essential requirements of patient safety, data privacy, and algo- rithmic accountability. Through the promotion of collaboration, harmonization, and continuous adaptation, regulatory frameworks can foster an environment conducive to the responsible devel- opment and deployment of SaMD, all while upholding the highest ethical standards and legal safeguards.

Ultimately, the effective regulation of SaMD relies on a multifaceted approach that involves all stakeholders, including healthcare providers, technology firms, patient advocacy organizations, and legal experts. By fostering collaboration and a shared commitment to ethical and responsible innovation, stakeholders can unlock the full potential of SaMD, ensuring that patient safety, trust, and dignity remain central to the healthcare system.

References

- Blenkinsopp, T., & Frost, C. (2020). Navigating the regulatory pathway for software as a medical device: A european perspective. *Digital Health Legal*, *7*(2), 45–52.
- Breglio, K., & Ryan, M. (2021). Adaptive regulatory models for medical devices and their impact on post-market surveillance. *Journal of Medical Device Regulation*, *34*(1), 55–68. https:
- //doi.org/10.1016/j.meddev.2021.01.003
- Brown, R. (2020). Quantum computing applications in healthcare and medicine: A review of cur- rent progress and future prospects. *Journal of Medical Systems*, *44*(11), 191. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10916-020-01734-3
- Canada, H. (2019). Software as a medical device (samd): Definition and classification. https :
- / / www. canada. ca/ en/ health- canada/ services/ drugs- health- products/ medical- devices/ application-information/guidance-documents/software-medical-device-guidance-document. html
- Chen, I. Y., Joshi, S., & Ghassemi, M. (2020). Treating health disparities with artificial intelligence.
- *Nature Medicine*, *26*(1), 16–17. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0589-2
- Cohen, I. G., & Mello, M. M. (2020). Big data, big tech, and protecting patient privacy. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, *323*(5), 409–410. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2019. 21476
- Commission, E. (2017). *Medical devices: Guidance document on classification of medical devices* (tech. rep.). https://ec.europa.eu/docsroom/documents/10337/attachments/1/translations/en/renditions/native
- Duran, J. M., & Jongsma, K. R. (2021). Who is afraid of black box algorithms? on the epistemo- logical and ethical basis of trust in medical ai. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, *47*(5), 329–335. https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2020-106820
- European Union Agency for Cybersecurity. (2019). Recommendations for the implementation of the healthcare sector cybersecurity framework. https://www.enisa.europa.eu/publications/recommendations - for - the - implementation - of - the - healthcare - sector - cybersecurity - framework
- Food & Administration, D. (2017). *Software as a medical device (samd): Clinical evaluation* (tech. rep.). https://www.fda.gov/media/100714/download
- Food & Administration, D. (2019). *Developing a software precertification program: A working model* (tech. rep.). https://www.fda.gov/media/119722/download
- Food & Administration, D. (2021). *Artificial intelligence and machine learning in software as a medical device* (tech. rep.). https : / / www. fda . gov/ medical- devices/ software- medical- device-samd/artificial-intelligence-and-machine-learning-software-medical-device
- Forum, I. M. D. R. (2013). *Software as a medical device (samd): Key definitions* (tech. rep.). http:
- //www.imdrf.org/docs/imdrf/final/technical/imdrf- tech- 131209- samd- key- definitions- 140901.pdf
- Forum, I. M. D. R. (2014). *Software as a medical device: Possible framework for risk categorization and corresponding considerations* (tech. rep.). http://www.imdrf.org/docs/imdrf/final/technical/imdrf-tech-140918-samd-framework-risk-categorization-141013.pdf
- Forum, I. M. D. R. (n.d.). Medical device single audit program (mdsap). https://www.imdrf.org/working-groups/medical-device-single-audit-program-mdsap
- Garzo, A., & Garay-Vitoria, N. (2021). Ethical and legal implications for technological devices in clinical research in europe: Flowchart design for ethical and legal decisions in clinical research. *XXI International Conference on Human Computer Interaction (Interacción '21)*. https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3471391.3471403
- Gerke, S., Minssen, T., & Cohen, G. (2020). Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence- driven healthcare. In *Artificial intelligence in healthcare* (pp. 295–336). https://doi.org/10. 1016/B978-0-12-818438-7.00012-5
- Global Harmonization Task Force. (2012). Principles of in vitro diagnostic (ivd) medical devices classification. http://www.imdrf.org/docs/ghtf/final/sg1/technical-docs/ghtf-sg1-n045r12- principles-ivd-medical-devices-classification-121102.pdf

- Hermon, R., & Williams, P. A. H. (2021). Software as a medical device (samd): Useful or useless term? *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics*, *284*, 85–89.
- Kramer, D. B., Xu, S., & Kesselheim, A. S. (2012). Regulation of medical devices in the united states and european union. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, *366*(9), 848–855.
- Larkin, H., & Mohan, S. (2021). Blockchain in healthcare: A comprehensive review of blockchain technology for data integrity in healthcare applications. *Health Informatics Journal*, *27*(3), 255–267. https://doi.org/10.1177/14604582211025684
- London, A. J. (2019). Artificial intelligence and black-box medical decisions: Accuracy versus explainability. *Hastings Center Report*, *49*(1), 15–21. https://doi.org/10.1002/hast.973
- Mehta, K., & Gupta, P. (2020). The role of blockchain technology in the future of healthcare systems. *International Journal of Healthcare Technology and Management*, *19*(2), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJHTM.2020.105112
- Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, *366*(6464), 447–453. https:
- //doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342
- Oriel STAT A MATRIX. (2021). Compliance requirements for medical device software and soft- ware as a medical device in the us and eu. https://www.orielstat.com/blog/compliance- requirements-for-medical-device-software-and-software-as-a-medical-device-in-the-us- and-eu/
- Panch, T., Mattie, H., & Atun, R. (2019). Artificial intelligence and algorithmic bias: Implications for health systems. *Journal of Global Health*, *9*(2), 010318. https://doi.org/10.7189/jogh. 09.020318
- Rajkomar, A., Hardt, M., Howell, M. D., Corrado, G., & Chin, M. H. (2018). Ensuring fairness in machine learning to advance health equity. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *169*(12), 866–872. https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-1990
- Research & Markets. (2021). *Software as a medical device (samd) market - global forecast to 2026* (tech. rep.). https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/5351765/software- as- a- medical-device-samd-market-global
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2021). Health insurance portability and account- ability act (hipaa) privacy rule. https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/privacy/index. html
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2018). Postmarket management of cybersecurity in medical devices. https://www.fda.gov/media/119933/download
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2021). Postmarket surveillance of medical devices. https:
- //www.fda.gov/medical-devices/postmarket-requirements/postmarket-surveillance
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (2020). Intellectual property and digital health. https:
- //www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo pub gh 2020 1.pdf