

including limit of blank, limit of detection, and limit of quantification.

(iv) Identification of risk mitigation elements used by the device, including a detailed description of all additional procedures, methods, and practices incorporated into the instructions for use that mitigate risks associated with testing the device.

(2) The 21 CFR 809.10 compliant labeling must include the following:

(i) The intended use statement in the 21 CFR 809.10(a)(2) and (b)(2) compliant labeling must include a statement that the results should be interpreted by a pathologist or equivalent professional in conjunction with other clinical and laboratory findings. The intended use statement must also include information on what the device detects and measures, whether the device is qualitative, semi-quantitative, and/or quantitative, the clinical indications for which the device is to be used, and the specific population(s) for which the device is intended.

(ii) A detailed description of the performance studies conducted to comply with paragraph (b)(1)(iii) of this section and a summary of the results.

(3) As part of the risk management activities performed under 21 CFR 820.30 design controls, product labeling and instruction manuals must include clear examples of all expected phenotypic patterns and gating strategies using well-defined clinical samples representative of both abnormal and normal cellular populations. These samples must be selected based upon the indications described in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section.

Dated: December 20, 2017.

**Leslie Kux,**

*Associate Commissioner for Policy.*

[FR Doc. 2017-27855 Filed 12-26-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4164-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

#### 21 CFR Part 882

[Docket No. FDA-2017-N-6642]

#### Medical Devices; Neurological Devices; Classification of the Computerized Behavioral Therapy Device for Psychiatric Disorders

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Final order.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or we) is

classifying the computerized behavioral therapy device for psychiatric disorders into class II (special controls). The special controls that apply to the device type are identified in this order and will be part of the codified language for the computerized behavioral therapy device for psychiatric disorders' classification. We are taking this action because we have determined that classifying the device into class II (special controls) will provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness of the device. We believe this action will also enhance patients' access to beneficial innovative devices, in part by reducing regulatory burdens.

**DATES:** This order is effective December 27, 2017. The classification was applicable on September 14, 2017.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Patrick Antkowiak, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 66, Rm. 2663, Silver Spring, MD 20993-0002, 240-402-3705, [Patrick.Antkowiak@fda.hhs.gov](mailto:Patrick.Antkowiak@fda.hhs.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### I. Background

Upon request, FDA has classified the computerized behavioral therapy device for psychiatric disorders as class II (special controls), which we have determined will provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness. In addition, we believe this action will enhance patients' access to beneficial innovation, in part by reducing regulatory burdens by placing the device into a lower device class than the automatic class III assignment.

The automatic assignment of class III occurs by operation of law and without any action by FDA, regardless of the level of risk posed by the new device. Any device that was not in commercial distribution before May 28, 1976, is automatically classified as, and remains within, class III and requires premarket approval unless and until FDA takes an action to classify or reclassify the device (see 21 U.S.C. 360c(f)(1)). We refer to these devices as "postamendments devices" because they were not in commercial distribution prior to the date of enactment of the Medical Device Amendments of 1976, which amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act).

FDA may take a variety of actions in appropriate circumstances to classify or reclassify a device into class I or II. We may issue an order finding a new device to be substantially equivalent under section 513(i) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360c(i)) to a predicate device that does not require premarket approval.

We determine whether a new device is substantially equivalent to a predicate by means of the procedures for premarket notification under section 510(k) of the FD&C Act and part 807 (21 U.S.C. 360(k) and 21 CFR part 807, respectively).

FDA may also classify a device through "De Novo" classification, a common name for the process authorized under section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act. Section 207 of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997 established the first procedure for De Novo classification (Pub. L. 105-115). Section 607 of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act modified the De Novo application process by adding a second procedure (Pub. L. 112-144). A device sponsor may utilize either procedure for De Novo classification.

Under the first procedure, the person submits a 510(k) for a device that has not previously been classified. After receiving an order from FDA classifying the device into class III under section 513(f)(1) of the FD&C Act, the person then requests a classification under section 513(f)(2).

Under the second procedure, rather than first submitting a 510(k) and then a request for classification, if the person determines that there is no legally marketed device upon which to base a determination of substantial equivalence, that person requests a classification under section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act.

Under either procedure for De Novo classification, FDA shall classify the device by written order within 120 days. The classification will be according to the criteria under section 513(a)(1) of the FD&C Act. Although the device was automatically placed within class III, the De Novo classification is considered to be the initial classification of the device.

We believe this De Novo classification will enhance patients' access to beneficial innovation, in part by reducing regulatory burdens. When FDA classifies a device into class I or II via the De Novo process, the device can serve as a predicate for future devices of that type, including for 510(k)s (see 21 U.S.C. 360c(f)(2)(B)(i)). As a result, other device sponsors do not have to submit a De Novo request or premarket approval application in order to market a substantially equivalent device (see 21 U.S.C. 360c(i), defining "substantial equivalence"). Instead, sponsors can use the less-burdensome 510(k) process, when necessary, to market their device.

**II. De Novo Classification**

On May 16, 2016, Pear Therapeutics, Inc., submitted a request for De Novo classification of the reSET. FDA reviewed the request in order to classify the device under the criteria for classification set forth in section 513(a)(1) of the FD&C Act.

We classify devices into class II if general controls by themselves are insufficient to provide reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness, but there is sufficient information to establish special controls that, in combination with the general controls, provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device for

its intended use (see 21 U.S.C. 360c(a)(1)(B)). After review of the information submitted in the request, we determined that the device can be classified into class II with the establishment of special controls. FDA has determined that these special controls, in addition to the general controls, will provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device.

Therefore, on September 14, 2017, FDA issued an order to the requester classifying the device into class II. FDA is codifying the classification of the device by adding 21 CFR 882.5801. We have named the generic type of device computerized behavioral therapy device

for psychiatric disorders, and it is identified as a prescription only device intended to provide a computerized version of condition-specific behavioral therapy as an adjunct to clinician supervised outpatient treatment to patients with psychiatric conditions. The digital therapy is intended to provide patients access to therapy tools used during treatment sessions to improve recognized treatment outcomes.

FDA has identified the following risks to health associated specifically with this type of device and the measures required to mitigate these risks in table 1.

**TABLE 1—COMPUTERIZED BEHAVIORAL THERAPY DEVICE FOR PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS RISKS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Identified risks	Mitigation measures
Device provides ineffective treatment, leading to worsening condition ...	Clinical data; Software verification, validation, and hazard analysis; and labeling.
Device software failure, leading to delayed access .....	Software verification, validation, and hazard analysis; and Labeling.
Use error/improper device use .....	Labeling.

FDA has determined that special controls, in combination with the general controls, address these risks to health and provide reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness. For a device to fall within this classification, and thus avoid automatic classification in class III, it would have to comply with the special controls named in this final order. The necessary special controls appear in the regulation codified by this order. This device is subject to premarket notification requirements under section 510(k) of the FD&C Act.

At the time of classification, computerized behavioral therapy devices for psychiatric disorders are for prescription use only. Prescription devices are exempt from the requirement for adequate directions for use for the layperson under section 502(f)(1) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 352(f)(1)) and 21 CFR 801.5, as long as the conditions of 21 CFR 801.109 are met (referring to 21 U.S.C. 352(f)(1)).

**III. Analysis of Environmental Impact**

The Agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.34(b) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

**IV. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995**

This final order establishes special controls that refer to previously

approved collections of information found in other FDA regulations. These collections of information are subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520). The collections of information in the guidance document “De Novo Classification Process (Evaluation of Automatic Class III Designation)” have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0844; the collections of information in 21 CFR part 814, subparts A through E, regarding premarket approval, have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0231; the collections of information in part 807, subpart E, regarding premarket notification submissions, have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0120; and the collections of information in 21 CFR part 801, regarding labeling, have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0485.

**List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 882**

Medical devices, Neurological devices.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, 21 CFR part 882 is amended as follows:

**PART 882—NEUROLOGICAL DEVICES**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 882 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 21 U.S.C. 351, 360, 360c, 360e, 360j, 360l, 371.

■ 2. Add § 882.5801 to subpart F to read as follows:

**§ 882.5801 Computerized behavioral therapy device for psychiatric disorders.**

(a) *Identification.* A computerized behavioral therapy device for psychiatric disorders is a prescription only device intended to provide a computerized version of condition-specific behavioral therapy as an adjunct to clinician supervised outpatient treatment to patients with psychiatric conditions. The digital therapy is intended to provide patients access to therapy tools used during treatment sessions to improve recognized treatment outcomes.

(b) *Classification.* Class II (special controls). The special controls for this device are:

(1) Clinical data must be provided to fulfill the following:

(i) Describe a validated model of behavioral therapy for the psychiatric disorder; and

(ii) Validate the model of behavioral therapy as implemented by the device.

(2) Software must be described in detail in the software requirements specification (SRS) and software design specification (SDS). Software verification, validation, and hazard analysis must be performed. Software documentation must demonstrate that the device effectively implements the behavioral therapy model.

(3) The following labeling must be provided:

(i) Patient and physician labeling must include instructions for use, including images that demonstrate how to interact with the device.

(ii) Patient and physician labeling must list compatible devices.

(iii) Patient and physician labeling must include a warning that the device is not intended for use as a standalone therapy.

(iv) Patient and physician labeling must include a warning that the device does not represent a substitution for the patient's medication.

(v) Physician labeling must include a summary of the clinical testing with the device.

Dated: December 20, 2017.

**Leslie Kux,**

*Associate Commissioner for Policy.*

[FR Doc. 2017-27843 Filed 12-26-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4164-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

#### 21 CFR Part 882

[Docket No. FDA-2017-N-6531]

#### Medical Devices; Neurological Devices; Classification of the External Vagal Nerve Stimulator for Headache

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Final order.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or we) is classifying the external vagal nerve stimulator for headache into class II (special controls). The special controls that apply to the device type are identified in this order and will be part of the codified language for the external vagal nerve stimulator for headache's classification. We are taking this action because we have determined that classifying the device into class II (special controls) will provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness of the device. We believe this action will also enhance patients' access to beneficial innovative devices, in part by reducing regulatory burdens.

**DATES:** This order is effective December 27, 2017. The classification was applicable on April 14, 2017.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William Heetderks, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 66, Rm. 2682, Silver Spring,

MD 20993-0002, 240-402-5360, [William.Heetderks@fda.hhs.gov](mailto:William.Heetderks@fda.hhs.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

Upon request, FDA has classified the external vagal nerve stimulator for headache as class II (special controls), which we have determined will provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness. In addition, we believe this action will enhance patients' access to beneficial innovation, in part by reducing regulatory burdens by placing the device into a lower device class than the automatic class III assignment.

The automatic assignment of class III occurs by operation of law and without any action by FDA, regardless of the level of risk posed by the new device. Any device that was not in commercial distribution before May 28, 1976, is automatically classified as, and remains within, class III and requires premarket approval unless and until FDA takes an action to classify or reclassify the device (see 21 U.S.C. 360c(f)(1)). We refer to these devices as "postamendments devices" because they were not in commercial distribution prior to the date of enactment of the Medical Device Amendments of 1976, which amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act).

FDA may take a variety of actions in appropriate circumstances to classify or reclassify a device into class I or II. We may issue an order finding a new device to be substantially equivalent under section 513(i) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360c(i)) to a predicate device that does not require premarket approval. We determine whether a new device is substantially equivalent to a predicate by means of the procedures for premarket notification under section 510(k) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360(k)) and part 807 (21 CFR part 807).

FDA may also classify a device through "De Novo" classification, a common name for the process authorized under section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act. Section 207 of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997 established the first procedure for De Novo classification (Pub. L. 105-115). Section 607 of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act modified the De Novo application process by adding a second procedure (Pub. L. 112-144). A device sponsor may utilize either procedure for De Novo classification.

Under the first procedure, the person submits a 510(k) for a device that has not previously been classified. After receiving an order from FDA classifying the device into class III under section 513(f)(1) of the FD&C Act, the person

then requests a classification under section 513(f)(2).

Under the second procedure, rather than first submitting a 510(k) and then a request for classification, if the person determines that there is no legally marketed device upon which to base a determination of substantial equivalence, that person requests a classification under section 513(f)(2) of the FD&C Act.

Under either procedure for De Novo classification, FDA shall classify the device by written order within 120 days. The classification will be according to the criteria under section 513(a)(1) of the FD&C Act. Although the device was automatically placed within class III, the De Novo classification is considered to be the initial classification of the device.

We believe this De Novo classification will enhance patients' access to beneficial innovation, in part by reducing regulatory burdens. When FDA classifies a device into class I or II via the De Novo process, the device can serve as a predicate for future devices of that type, including for 510(k)s (see 21 U.S.C. 360c(f)(2)(B)(i)). As a result, other device sponsors do not have to submit a De Novo request or premarket approval application in order to market a substantially equivalent device (see 21 U.S.C. 360c(i), defining "substantial equivalence"). Instead, sponsors can use the less-burdensome 510(k) process, when necessary, to market their device.

##### II. De Novo Classification

On October 16, 2015, electroCore, LLC, submitted a request for De Novo classification of the gammaCore Non-invasive Vagus Nerve Stimulator. FDA reviewed the request in order to classify the device under the criteria for classification set forth in section 513(a)(1) of the FD&C Act.

We classify devices into class II if general controls by themselves are insufficient to provide reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness, but there is sufficient information to establish special controls that, in combination with the general controls, provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device for its intended use (see 21 U.S.C. 360c(a)(1)(B)). After review of the information submitted in the request, we determined that the device can be classified into class II with the establishment of special controls. FDA has determined that these special controls, in addition to the general controls, will provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device.