©IDOSR PUBLICATIONS

ISSN: 2579-0803

©IDOSR PUBLICATIONS
International Digital Organization for Scientific Research IDOSRJCAS10200
IDOSR JOURNAL OF COMPUTER AND APPLIED SCIENCES 10(2):30-37, 2025.
https://doi.org/10.59298/JCAS/2025/1023037

Regulatory Challenges in Medical Device Engineering

Abdullahi Abdirahim Bashiir

Faculty of Engineering Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Medical device engineering is a rapidly evolving field at the intersection of health sciences and advanced technologies. While innovation drives the development of novel devices, particularly wearable sensors and digital health solutions, the regulatory landscape presents significant challenges. This paper examines the multifaceted regulatory frameworks governing medical device design, approval, and post-market surveillance, primarily focusing on U.S. FDA and European Union requirements. It analyzes the classification schemes (Class I-III), approval pathways (exemption, 510(k), and PMA), and the role of regulatory bodies in shaping safe and effective product delivery. Key challenges include the complexity of compliance for academic and industry stakeholders, the evolving expectations for cybersecurity, and the rising importance of Quality Management Systems (QMS) in meeting ISO 13485 standards. The paper also highlights the need for agile, collaborative methodologies to streamline regulatory navigation during early-stage design. As regulatory demands increase in both scope and specificity, the study proposes a flexible "design toolbox" framework to support engineers, clinicians, and developers in aligning innovation with compliance. Emphasis is placed on bridging regulatory understanding through early consultation, pre-submission dialogue, and a structured, risk-based approach to approval and surveillance.

Keywords: Medical Device Engineering, Regulatory Compliance, FDA Approval Pathways, 510(k) Process, Premarket Approval (PMA), Wearable Medical Devices, ISO 13485.

INTRODUCTION

Design and testing of medical devices represents a challenging engineering discipline, integrating diverse technologies like electronics, photonics, mechanics, biomaterials, and bioelectronics. This complexity can complicate even simple device designs. Additionally, the development process is heavily regulated, with strict guidelines that must be followed to prevent serious legal repercussions. Recently, universities lacking a medical device design history are expanding their research and development efforts, but they face regulatory challenges once the devices serve commercial purposes. Critical questions arise: Is this a medical device? Are there governing standards? How to adhere to them? An existing simple addendum to methodologies in medical design literature offers guidance but is insufficient for rapid changes in the field. The advent of wearable sensors, offering real-time monitoring and home care capabilities, requires faster design processes than traditional devices like cardio-stimulators. This paper presents a toolbox for medical devices, particularly wearable sensors, aiming to provide flexible guidelines that streamline design processes and stimulate discussion on shifting paradigms in medical engineering education. Each element of the toolbox results from collaboration between physicians and engineers with diverse expertise. Methods and tools are organized under a common framework to address design requirements effectively: preliminary studies, industrial design, software development, and post-production analysis. The toolbox's design clusters various methods/tools around specific requirements, detailing the means/devices used to implement them, along with their inputs, outputs, and necessary precondition [1, 2].

Overview of Regulatory Frameworks

Guidelines for the design and use of medical devices are established by clinical engineering professionals and regulatory authorities to ensure safety and efficacy for patients and the public. However, navigating these regulations can be challenging for clients who often struggle to understand the different regulatory

processes for medical device and drug development. Inquiries about the path forward can result in overwhelming technical reference documents and notes, leading clients to contemplate hiring consultants to help navigate these complexities. Unfortunately, divergent interpretations of the same documents make this collaboration often futile. Medical devices are categorized into three classes based on patient risk: Class I (low risk), Class II (moderate risk), and Class III (high risk). This classification significantly influences the appropriate regulatory pathway with the FDA. The three common regulatory pathways include Exemption Status, in which manufacturers may claim their devices are similar to existing ones, often resulting in some devices being exempt from premarket submission. While exempted devices, mostly Class I and some Class II, involve low or non-significant risk and can be evaluated in about four weeks, they can also lead to severe consequences if clearance is not obtained after market introduction. The 510(k) process serves as a premarket notification to the FDA, asserting that a product is safe and effective. This process requires 1-2 technical documents and an additional 10-15 pages detailing quality assurance protocols, encompassing various testing levels for the product, from general to product-specific. Regulatory experts often recommend submitting a 510(k) when uncertain about the device classification or approval pathway, given the potential risks of navigating the regulatory landscape without proper clearance [3, 4].

Types of Medical Devices

Medical devices are classified into one of three groups based on potential risk to patients. These classifications, in addition to how the device is marketed, play an important role in determining the appropriate FDA regulatory pathway. The three most common regulatory pathways are: (1) exemption status, (2) 510(k); and (3) premarket approval (PMA). This section describes these classification schemes and how they differ in terms of associated work needed to receive market clearance or approval. All devices with more than a low or non-significant risk potential must be granted clearance, approval, or an Investigational Device Exemption (IDE) from the FDA prior to use in human subjects. The purpose of pre-submission meetings, including the key information included in these documents and the benefits and risks of requesting this type of meeting, are described. These meetings allow innovators and device companies to meet with the FDA for feedback on the potential pathway and research protocols. Early involvement of a regulatory expert or consultant, ideally at the outset of the project, can lead to a reduction in time to market and important cost savings. FDA regulation hinges on the invasiveness and risk level of the device, which determines its class. In general, devices are classified into Class I, Class II, or Class III, in order of increasing invasiveness and risk. There are very few Class I devices, since most any device intending to provide any calorie or medicine input to the body must comply with stricter Class II or III classification. For devices with a low or non-significant risk potential, the regulatory process may be straightforward with exempt status. On the other hand, more involved devices require a formal application through premarket clearance using the 510(k) process or the premarket approval (PMA) pathway, with the former as a quicker and less costly, but dependent on the device having a predicate that has received FDA approval. Novel or high-risk devices would usually require the PMA pathway, which is often longer and requires larger clinical trials [5, 6].

Regulatory Bodies and Their Roles

A review of medical device regulation in the U.S. and Europe reveals key differences in their systems. The Medical Device Amendment of 1976, part of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, established a risk classification system for medical devices. Devices are categorized into three classes: Class I (minimal risk), Class II (requires performance standards and may need premarket notification), and Class III (life-sustaining, requiring direct premarket approval for safety and efficacy). Medical devices encompass various instruments and aids intended for physiological effects or disease treatment, excluding certain drugs and biologics. The legislation also established the Medical Device and Radiological Health Center within the FDA, introducing preemption, which grants immunity to manufacturers from tort claims diverging from conditions approved when the device was sold. Several premarket processes were created for new devices: 1) Device classification based on required regulation level, where preemption often blocked tort claims related to MDA's actions. 2) 510(k) review, a process determining a device's substantial equivalence to existing marketed devices, typically with less stringent data requirements, allowing many devices to save on compliance costs. 3) Premarket approval (PMA), established as a process where manufacturers propose investigations for device safety and effectiveness, differing significantly from drug and biologic approval processes [7, 8].

Pre-Market Approval Process

U.S. medical devices and other FDA-regulated products are classified into one of three groups based on potential risk to the patient: exempt devices, 510(k) devices, and premarket approval (PMA) devices. This classification plays an especially important role in determining the appropriate path by which the FDA

will regulate a device. There are three most common regulatory pathways through which the FDA clears or approves medical devices: exemption status, 510(k), and PMA. All devices with more than a low or non-significant risk potential must be granted clearance, approval, or an Investigational Device Exemption (IDE) exemption from the FDA prior to use in human subjects. Pre-submission, or Q-sub meetings, allow innovators and device companies to meet with the FDA and obtain feedback on the potential pathway and research protocols. Early involvement of a regulatory expert or consultant can lead to a dramatic reduction in time to market or important cost savings. FDA regulation hinges on the invasiveness and risk level of the device. Simple, non-invasive devices containing limited electrical components, such as bandages, often fall under exempt status and are subject to little or no regulation at all. Exempt devices must still be registered with the FDA, but are not subject to non-clinical testing requirements and the 510(k) process. Depending on device class, the regulatory process may be straightforward with exempt status or far more laborious, requiring formal application through premarket clearance using the 510(k) process or the more rigorous premarket approval (PMA) pathway. The former is often quicker, less costly, and requires less robust clinical evidence. This path assumes the device has a predicate that has already received FDA approval. Novel devices or those determined as high risk usually require the PMA path, which is far more laborious and frequently requires larger clinical trials. Learning the basics of FDA regulation is critical for all innovators, and navigating the intricacies of the regulatory landscape almost always requires the guidance of experts or consultants [9, 10].

Post-Market Surveillance

The Medical Devices Regulation and In-vitro Diagnostic Medical Devices Regulation introduce a series of new and significant obligations for manufacturers concerning post-market surveillance. These regulations necessitate that manufacturers develop a comprehensive post-market surveillance plan. This plan should meticulously detail the methodologies they employ to effectively collect and utilize data on various aspects, including safety, performance, and vigilance reporting associated with their medical devices. This revision aims to clearly outline the requisite contents of the post-market surveillance plan that manufacturers must adhere to under the new regulations concerning CE marking. It is essential for manufacturers to thoroughly understand the updated and nuanced requirements regarding post-market surveillance and vigilance reporting pertinent to their devices. Post-market surveillance involves a continuous process of learning derived from all forms of available information throughout the lifecycle of a device. This process requires a systematic approach to the collection and analysis of data. The post-market surveillance plan must adequately demonstrate compliance with the relevant regulatory obligations while also addressing the methodologies for the collection and usage of available information. Additionally, suggested headings and contents that should be included in the plan and reporting formats are provided in clear tables, designed to assist in the structuring of the documentation. The overall surveillance plan consists of two main phases: preparation and submission. During the submission phase, manufacturers are required to include a periodic summary along with detailed reports on individual safety events related to their devices. It is imperative for manufacturers to ensure that they provide timely updates concerning any modifications in their planning and reporting processes. This responsiveness is critical in maintaining adherence to the evolving regulatory landscape and ensuring the ongoing safety and efficacy of medical devices in the market [11, 12].

Quality Management Systems (QMS)

The organization must establish and document a quality management system (QMS) that conforms to the requirements of ISO 13485. As a minimum, the organization must ensure that the QMS is effectively implemented and maintained. Documentation of the QMS must include at a minimum: a. A quality manual that includes the scope of the QMS and reference to the documented procedures and/or the locations of these procedures b. Quality policy, objectives, and planning, including strategies and consideration of regulatory requirements, and maintaining the policy and objectives. c. A description of the structure of the organization, including the responsibilities and authorities of personnel who manage, perform, and verify work affecting quality d. Description of the interaction between the processes of the QMS e. Documented procedures required by ISO 13485 f. Documents needed by the organization to ensure the effective planning, operation, and control of its processes g. Modification or change control procedure to ensure QMS documentation is consistent and maintained. Management, irrespective of its formal executive authority, must demonstrate a commitment to the development and implementation of the QMS and continually improve its effectiveness. a. By ensuring that the quality policy and quality objectives are established, compatible, and aligned with strategies. b. By ensuring that the QMS is effectively implemented and maintained. c. By ensuring that appropriate resources are available to: i. ensure that the QMS conforms to the requirements of ISO 13485 and is effectively implemented and maintained ii. evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the QMS iii. ensure that the QMS is effective in

protecting and enhancing the organization's processes and their products. d. By ensuring that personnel performing work affecting quality are competent on the basis of appropriate education, training, skills, and experience. e. By ensuring that included parties reach the requirements, including: own supplier approval and quality monitoring system, planning and control of their activities, delivery of data capturing and manufacturing system on minimum duration, own ("in-line") inspection and quality monitoring procedures, corrective actions, and delivery of the documentation and records. f. By promoting and conveying the importance of the QMS, understanding its contributions and cost-benefit ratio [13, 14].

Clinical Trials and Regulatory Compliance

In addition to the design and engineering challenges of developing innovative medical devices that are safe and effective, a group of challenges arises from the approval pathway. The regulatory environment is evolving, and companies that design, engineer, or test medical devices (or plan to do so) need to remain attuned to the changes. They also need to participate as early as feasible in designing verification and validation tests to comply with the regulatory requirements. Like issues for companies developing drugs, approval for medical devices can be unpredictable, time-consuming, and expensive. The regulatory footprints for medical devices and drugs are distinct, with devices drawing heavily on the three components of preclinical, clinical, and regulatory work before market approval. Devices require less testing than drugs and generally attract lower regulatory fees. High-risk devices, however, can face millions of dollars in direct costs and years of delays just conducting animal studies until clinical trials, and innovative devices may share additional delays and costs due to the unpredictability of the regulatory pathway. Even with similar challenges, the regulatory environment for devices is evolving differently than for drugs, resulting in different patterns of approval speed and outcomes between the two domains. Two notable changes impacting the regulatory pathway for clinical studies of new device technologies are Europe's new Medical Device Regulation and the FDA's new Proposed Rulemaking for Risk-Based Classification of Software. By early 2020, companies and consultants had begun to participate in discussions with the FDA to clarify the various components of the new classification standards. The 2020s will also be a time of uncertain fissure between pre- and post-market requirements for drug and device products where some medical technologies will lie in both categories. The FDA's emphasis on pre-market safety and efficacy evidence led to a legally enforceable system for medications but never extended to devices. In 2007, an FDA amendment proffered an expanded system of post-market sensors for devices. On May 11, 2018, the FDA also announced plans to develop a system to more deeply analyze post-marketing data for both drugs and devices [15, 16].

Challenges in Regulatory Compliance

Implementing regulatory compliance in the medical device domain requires an understanding of regulatory requirements. Compliance with regulatory requirements is one of the most significant quality characteristics of a medical device. Before a medical device can be placed on the EU market, it must comply with the regulatory framework of the EU. This compliance is assessed against requirements set in regulations. Compliance is also needed for the processes by which the device is being manufactured and maintained, and these processes must comply with the regulations placing additional burdens on the manufacturers. At present, EU legislation in the medical device domain is undergoing a transition. Three former directives are in the process of being replaced by two new regulations. This transition from the Medical Device Directive (MDD) and In-Vitro Diagnostic Directive (IVDD) to the Medical Device Regulation (MDR) and In-Vitro Diagnostic Regulation (IVDR) means a considerable increase in the number of requirements. While the former directives were written in an earlier era of more general wording and significant opportunities for interpretation, the new regulations are more detailed and prescriptive. This means that manufacturers must have broader documentation and more stringent processes. Prior to the entry into force of the new regulations, there exists a window of opportunity for manufacturers to adapt to the transition. Because the new requirements especially concerning cybersecurity are defined to a significant detail, understanding new requirements is paramount. Furthermore, medical devices are currently not only moving toward a more regulated era but also toward a more interconnected era. That is, in addition to the traditional functionality, there are added features that require connectivity with external systems. Many countries around the world want to seize the benefits of such features but are also raising the needs for security and safety concerning connectivity. Therefore, the compliance with security and safety needs become pertinent [17, 18].

Emerging Technologies and Regulations

Emerging technology is crucial for innovation and product development across various fields. Many successful technologies have significantly influenced daily life, while some have failed. Engineering is essential in developing, manufacturing, and marketing new technologies. It underpins the form, function,

efficacy, and safety of products. Engineers must ensure their designs align with customer needs and comply with manufacturing and market standards before market release. Health regulations can complicate this process, especially for medical devices, which are subject to strict controls worldwide due to health risks. Regulatory bodies oversee the reliability, effectiveness, and safety of these devices throughout their market journey. In Europe, medical devices can attain CE marking after certification of safety and efficiency. Understanding current and future regulatory requirements is vital, as this clarity can be integrated into the engineering phase to help meet challenges. Wearable sensors are gaining traction in healthcare for remote monitoring of biomedical signals and patient conditions. Data from these devices can help detect impairments and prompt timely intervention by healthcare personnel. They also empower patients to track their health, but the effectiveness and safety of these devices are paramount. They must meet various health standards. Thus, wearable sensors rely on traditional nonwearable sensors for comprehensive integration into clinical use and commercialization [19, 20].

International Harmonization Efforts

In the U.S., the FDA allows the medical device approval process to differ depending on its risk-based classification. Rating devices as Class III requires premarket approval and stringent review for assurance of safety and efficacy. Class II devices require premarket notification that determines whether the device is categorized as equivalent to a substantial device already on the market. Class I devices not considering a risk are exempt from premarket approval while regulation is limited to facility-wide compliance with the Quality Systems Regulation. On the other hand, the EU formerly recognized pre-market approvals needed safety and performance verification through an external auditor without indicating clinical evidence. The MDR explores justification on existent market with no comparable device for a high-risk Class III implantable surgical devices needing clinical studies while eligibility for CE mark update is still ambiguous. The regulatory model demands a one-stop shop toward standard review process for advanced processing, assurance of device safety, assurance of interoperability, recognition of foreign clinical data and market approval. The approval process is empowered with global leadership toward real world evidence with a translational effort by creating a tool to review evaluation adopted in other health authorities and device reliability by representative pledge. The device portfolio information should include pre-market false claims on claims deemed reliable and wireless medical devices to enhance security and safety of the patients. As a key ingredient of the U.S. effort to enhance regulatory science, it also seeks to recognize health agencies although harmonization challenges remain in monitoring devices [21, 22].

Case Studies in Regulatory Challenges

The evolution of the regulatory environment is largely driven by legal needs at national and supranational levels, yet these changes significantly affect market participants' behavior. This study examines whether specific companies in the medical devices market consider these changes, focusing on the EU and ISO21420 standard. Preliminary results suggest that EU regulations are acknowledged only in a general sense, with minor improvements in employee working models and documentation following the ISO21420 adoption. Medical devices greatly influence modern healthcare, aiming to enhance care quality and system efficiency. Ranging from basic items like tubes to complex systems like robotic surgical devices, these products are at the forefront of rapid technological progress to address healthcare challenges. Their development is multifaceted, requiring extensive specialized knowledge. While the importance of innovation in the medical device sector is recognized, its effect on society, the market, and the economy is often tied to national and global regulations. This contribution aims to evaluate the influence of new EU regulations and the ISO21420 standard on selected medical device companies. It includes a structured interview based on newly analyzed legislation, leading to empirical results. A case study of SMEs in the medical device development and production sector highlights changes in the Czech market, with other results correlating to Eurostat data calculated by international scientific collaborators [23, 24].

Future Trends in Medical Device Regulation

The regulatory landscape for medical devices is continually evolving, often in response to changing market demands or recent safety-related events. Regulation is an important component of many product engineering initiatives; insufficient or poorly designed regulations can result in products being either more costly or less effective than intended or even dangerous. With the closing years of the first decade of the twenty-first century, safety advisories on a 2007 titanium orthopedic implant, artificial hip joints, surfaced. The FDA's 510(k) application for implants was mandated by law. Although similar devices had been in use for years, several safety advisories prompted the request. A series of global class action lawsuits were filed to compensate injured patients. Improving the design of regulatory authorities,

workflows, and regulations is therefore a challenge facing engineers in 2010. All of these issues must be investigated, taking into account the unique aspects of engineering practices in different professional groups; preliminary recommendations must be formulated for manufacturers of medical devices to improve the quality and efficiency of their engineering processes. Regulation is defined as instructions for action, rules, standards, or social codes for governing human behavior. In many markets, including medical technology, regulations specify organizational, management, and engineering processes in detail, leaving little room for professional discretion. If regulations remain unchanged during technology projects, compliance entails simply executing a procedure, a process that in principle does not require professional expertise or creativity. Engineering regulations and compliance consist of quite diverse activities, processes, products, and characteristics. Any device that is marketed as a medical product must undergo regulatory scrutiny in parallel with product evaluation. The present regulatory process often aggravates poor functional safety and market oversaturation. Low-cost devices may be designed exclusively for novelty or marketing hype rather than patient benefit or usability [25, 26].

Collaboration between Engineers and Regulators

To align priorities, engineers must collaborate with regulators during device ideation and development stages. The optimal time to engage is before submitting a regulatory application, though early opportunities include initial brainstorming, proof of concept validation, and preclinical testing. Navigating FDA regulations requires careful planning for each step, as decisions generate further questions and assumptions that must be addressed. Each element incurs costs, impacting budgets and timelines tied to marketing claims within the regulatory application. By establishing milestones for time and cost, academic entrepreneurs can better estimate fundraising needs from the outset. While regulatory authorities permit claim modifications, starting with honest and conservative claims is advisable. Although not exhaustive, certain project management slides suffice for higher regulatory classes. The FDA advocates for early, frequent contact to prevent unexpected obstacles in the approval process. Consulting with regulatory experts early can yield time and cost savings. For novel devices, an Interactive Review or Pre-IDE meeting may be requested before submission, allowing discussions on proposed designs and feedback from the agency to enhance application success. However, these meetings may incur extra costs and time, with no guarantee of approval due to the agency's limited resources. Teams should first utilize the Product Classification Database to research similar devices, focusing on the Precedent Device Attribute section for key insights on attributes, benefits, risks, and special controls [27, 28, 29].

CONCLUSION

The landscape of medical device engineering is inherently complex due to its interdisciplinary nature and stringent regulatory oversight. As devices become more integrated with digital technologies and personalized care models, regulatory compliance becomes not just a requirement but a critical determinant of market viability and public safety. This paper has outlined the essential regulatory pathways, including exemption status, 510(k), and PMA, and underscored the importance of accurate classification and early regulatory consultation. It also examined the growing emphasis on post-market surveillance and Quality Management Systems, particularly in response to evolving EU and FDA standards. The convergence of wearable technologies and advanced sensors with healthcare delivery demands that engineering innovation be matched by regulatory foresight. By adopting a structured, collaborative design toolbox that incorporates regulatory principles from the outset, innovators can streamline device development and avoid costly compliance pitfalls. Moving forward, education and training in regulatory science must become a core component of medical engineering curricula to ensure future solutions meet both technological potential and regulatory demands.

REFERENCES

1. Ravizza A, De Maria C, Di Pietro L, Sternini F, Audenino AL, Bignardi C. Comprehensive review on current and future regulatory requirements on wearable sensors in preclinical and clinical testing. Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology. 2019 Nov 8;7:313.
2. Jin Z, He C, Fu J, Han Q, He Y. Balancing the customization and standardization: exploration and layout surrounding the regulation of the growing field of 3D-printed medical devices in China. Bio-design and Manufacturing. 2022 Jul;5(3):580-606.
3. Van Batavia J, Goldenberg S. FDA Device Regulation: 510 (k), PMA. Academic Entrepreneurship for Medical and Health Sciences. 2019 Sep 30.
4. Zhang W, Liu R, Chatwin C. Marketing authorization of medical devices in China. Journal of commercial biotechnology. 2016 Jan 1;22(1).

5. Muehlematter UJ, Daniore P, Vokinger KN. Approval of artificial intelligence and machine learning-based medical devices in the USA and Europe (2015–20): a comparative analysis. The Lancet Digital Health. 2021 Mar 1;3(3):e195-203. thelancet.com
6. Modjarrad K, Ebnesajjad S, editors. Handbook of polymer applications in medicine and medical devices. Elsevier; 2013 Dec 5.
7. Fink M, Akra B. Comparison of the international regulations for medical devices–USA versus Europe. Injury. 2023 Oct 1;54:110908.
8. Sastri VR. Plastics in medical devices: properties, requirements, and applications. William Andrew; 2021 Nov 24.
9. Ugwu Chinyere Nneoma, Ogenyi Fabian, Eze Hyginus Valentine and Ugwu Okechukwu Paul-Chima. Innovations in Renewable Energy for Health Applications. Eurasian Experiment Journal Of Medicine And Medical Sciences, 2025 6(1):75-81
10. Darrow JJ, Avorn J, Kesselheim AS. FDA regulation and approval of medical devices: 1976-2020. Jama. 2021 Aug 3;326(5):420-32.
11. Dubin JR, Simon SD, Norrell K, Perera J, Gowen J, Cil A. Risk of recall among medical devices undergoing US Food and Drug Administration 510 (k) clearance and premarket approval, 2008-2017. JAMA Network Open. 2021 May 3;4(5):e217274-. jamanetwork.com
12. Kingston R, Sioris K, Gualtieri J, Brutlag A, Droege W, Osimitz TG. Post-market surveillance of consumer products: framework for adverse event management. Regulatory toxicology and pharmacology. 2021 Nov 1;126:105028. sciencedirect.com
13. Cioeta R, Cossu A, Giovagnoni E, Rigoni M, Muti P. A new platform for post-marketing surveillance and real-world evidence data collection for substance-based medical devices. Frontiers in Drug Safety and Regulation. 2022 Dec 9;2:992359. frontiersin.org
14. Beitler BG, Abraham PF, Glennon AR, Tommasini SM, Lattanza LL, Morris JM, Wiznia DH. Interpretation of regulatory factors for 3D printing at hospitals and medical centers, or at the point of care. 3D Printing in Medicine. 2022 Feb 1;8(1):7.
15. Lu M. Resource Mobilization in Start-ups Implementing ISO 13485: An ethnographic case study.
16. Meskó B, Topol EJ. The imperative for regulatory oversight of large language models (or generative AI) in healthcare. NPJ digital medicine. 2023. nature.com
17. Skalidis I, Muller O, Fournier S. CardioVerse: The cardiovascular medicine in the era of Metaverse. Trends in cardiovascular medicine. 2023. sciencedirect.com
18. Bretthauer M, Gerke S, Hassan C, Ahmad OF, Mori Y. The new European medical device regulation: Balancing innovation and patient safety. Annals of internal medicine. 2023 Jun;176(6):844-8. uit.no
19. Health Organization W. Health technology assessment of medical devices. 2025. google.com
20. World Health Organization. Health technology assessment of medical devices. World Health Organization; 2025 May 30.
21. Sastri VR. Plastics in medical devices: properties, requirements, and applications. William Andrew; 2021 Nov 24.
22. Tio MC, Butler J, Zhu X, Obi Y, Yen TE, Kalantar-Zadeh K, Streja E, Dossabhoy NR, Hall ME, Shafi T. Individualized Risk for CKD Progression among US Adults. Journal of the American Society of Nephrology. 2024 May 22:10-681.
23. Haimerl M, Reich C. Risk-based evaluation of machine learning-based classification methods used for medical devices. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making. 2025 Mar 11;25(1):126.
24. Bai X, Wang KT, Tran TK, Sadiq M, Trung LM, Khudoykulov K. Measuring China's green economic recovery and energy environment sustainability: Econometric analysis of sustainable development goals. Economic Analysis and Policy. 2022 Sep 1;75:768-79. [HTML]
25. Díaz-Rodríguez N, Del Ser J, Coeckelbergh M, de Prado ML, Herrera-Viedma E, Herrera F. Connecting the dots in trustworthy Artificial Intelligence: From AI principles, ethics, and key requirements to responsible AI systems and regulation. Information Fusion. 2023 Nov 1;99:101896. sciencedirect.com
26. Admass WS, Munaye YY, Diro AA. Cyber security: State of the art, challenges and future directions. Cyber Security and Applications. 2024 Jan 1;2:100031.
27. Mohammed A. SOC Audits in Action: Best Practices for Strengthening Threat Detection and Ensuring Compliance. Baltic Journal of Engineering and Technology. 2023;2(1):62-9.

28. Miller AM, Behan R, Smith I, Griffin M, Keane F, Langan J, O'Rourke C, McAleenan N, Pandit A, Watson M. A multidisciplinary approach to online support for device research translation: regulatory change and clinical engagement. Health Policy and Technology. 2021 Mar 1;10(1):95-103.
29. Van Batavia J, Goldenberg SJ. Strategic planning and costs of FDA regulation. Academic Entrepreneurship for Medical and Health Sciences. 2019 Sep 30.

CITE AS: Abdullahi Abdirahim Bashiir **(2025).** Regulatory Challenges in Medical Device Engineering. IDOSR JOURNAL OF COMPUTER AND APPLIED SCIENCES 10(2):30-37. https://doi.org/10.59298/JCAS/2025/1023037