confidential with a heading or cover note that states "THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION." The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of objections. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on https://www.regulations.gov. Submit both copies to the Dockets Management Staff. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be made publicly available, you can provide this information on the cover sheet and not in the body of your objections and you must identify this information as "confidential." Any information marked as "confidential" will not be disclosed except in accordance with 21 CFR 10.20 and other applicable disclosure law. For more information about FDA’s posting of comments to public dockets, see 80 FR 56469, September 18, 2015, or access the information at: https://www.fda.gov/regulatoryinformation/dockets/default.htm.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper objections received, go to https://www.regulations.gov and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this document, into the “Search” box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Dockets Management Staff, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Chelsea Trull, Center for Veterinary Medicine, Food and Drug Administration, 7519 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 240–402–6729, chelsea.trull@fda.hhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In a document published in the Federal Register of May 30, 2017 (82 FR 24611), FDA announced that we had filed a food additive petition (animal use) (FAP 2301) submitted by BASF Corp., 100 Park Ave., Florham Park, NJ 07932. The petition proposed that the regulations for food additives permitted in feed and drinking water of animals be amended to provide for the safe use of formic acid as a feed acidifying agent in complete poultry feeds.

II. Conclusion

FDA concludes that the data establish the safety and utility of formic acid as an acidifying agent in complete poultry feeds and that the food additive regulations should be amended as set forth in this document. This is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 12866.

III. Public Disclosure

In accordance with §571.1(h) (21 CFR 571.1(h)), the petition and documents we considered and relied upon in reaching our decision to approve the petition will be made available for public disclosure (see FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT). As provided in §571.1(h), we will delete from the documents any materials that are not available for public disclosure.

IV. Environmental Impact

The Agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.32(e) 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.

V. Objections and Hearing Requests

Any person who will be adversely affected by this regulation may file with the Dockets Management Staff (see ADDRESSES) either electronic or written objections. Each objection shall be separately numbered, and each numbered objection shall specify with particularity the provision of the regulation to which objection is made and the grounds for the objection. Each numbered objection on which a hearing is requested shall specifically so state. Failure to request a hearing for any particular objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing on that objection. Each numbered objection for which a hearing is requested shall include a detailed description and analysis of the specific factual information intended to be presented in support of the objection in the event that a hearing is held. Failure to include such a description and analysis for any particular objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing on the objection.

Any objections received in response to the regulation may be seen in the Dockets Management Staff, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 573

Animal feeds, Food additives.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and redelegated to the Center for Veterinary Medicine, 21 CFR part 573 is amended as follows:

PART 573—FOOD ADDITIVES PERMITTED IN FEED AND DRINKING WATER OF ANIMALS

1. The authority citation for part 573 continues to read as follows:


2. In § 573.480, revise paragraph (b) introductory text and paragraph (b)(5)(iii)(B) to read as follows:

§573.480 Formic acid.

(b) The additive is used or intended for use as a feed acidifying agent, to lower the pH, in complete swine and poultry feeds at levels not to exceed 1.2 percent of the complete feed.

V. Objections and Hearing Requests

Any person who will be adversely affected by this regulation may file with the Dockets Management Staff (see ADDRESSES) either electronic or written objections.
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Medical Devices; Hematology and Pathology Devices; Classification of the Whole Slide Imaging System

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final order.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or we) is classifying the whole slide imaging system 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 whole slide imaging system’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.
FDMA 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 is required to 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)(1)). 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 December 1, 2016, Philips Medical Systems Nederland B.V. submitted a request for De Novo classification of the Philips IntelliSite Pathology Solution (PIPS). 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 classified 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)). 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 April 12, 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 864.3700. We have named the generic type of device the whole slide imaging system, and it is identified as an automated digital slide creation, viewing, and management system intended as an aid to the pathologist to review and interpret digital images of surgical pathology slides. The system generates digital images that would otherwise be appropriate for manual visualization by conventional light microscopy.

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—WHOLE SLIDE IMAGING SYSTEM RISKS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified risk</th>
<th>Mitigation measures/21 CFR Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate or missing results leading to, for example, incorrect diagnosis.</td>
<td>General controls; Special control (1) (21 CFR 864.3700(b)(1)); and, Special control (2) (21 CFR 864.3700(b)(2)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed results</td>
<td>General controls; Special control (1) (21 CFR 864.3700(b)(1)); and, Special control (2) (21 CFR 864.3700(b)(2)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDMA 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 is required to 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)(1)). 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 December 1, 2016, Philips Medical Systems Nederland B.V. submitted a request for De Novo classification of the Philips IntelliSite Pathology Solution (PIPS). 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 classified 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)). 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 April 12, 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 864.3700. We have named the generic type of device the whole slide imaging system, and it is identified as an automated digital slide creation, viewing, and management system intended as an aid to the pathologist to review and interpret digital images of surgical pathology slides. The system generates digital images that would otherwise be appropriate for manual visualization by conventional light microscopy.

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—WHOLE SLIDE IMAGING SYSTEM RISKS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified risk</th>
<th>Mitigation measures/21 CFR Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate or missing results leading to, for example, incorrect diagnosis.</td>
<td>General controls; Special control (1) (21 CFR 864.3700(b)(1)); and, Special control (2) (21 CFR 864.3700(b)(2)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed results</td>
<td>General controls; Special control (1) (21 CFR 864.3700(b)(1)); and, Special control (2) (21 CFR 864.3700(b)(2)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 21 CFR 807, subpart E, regarding premarket notification, have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0120; and the collections of information in 21 CFR parts 801 and 809, regarding labeling, have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0485.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 864

Blood, Medical devices, Packaging and containers.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, 21 CFR part 864 is amended as follows:

PART 864—HEMATOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY DEVICES

2. Add § 864.3700 to subpart D to read as follows:

§ 864.3700 Whole slide imaging system.

(a) Identification. The whole slide imaging system is an automated digital slide creation, viewing, and management system intended as an aid to the pathologist to review and interpret digital images of surgical pathology slides. The system generates digital images that would otherwise be appropriate for manual visualization by conventional light microscopy.

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

(1) Premarket notification submissions must include the following information:

(i) The indications for use must specify the tissue specimen that is intended to be used with the whole slide imaging system and the components of the system.

(ii) A detailed description of the device and bench testing results at the component level, including for the following, as appropriate:

(A) Slide feeder;

(B) Light source;

(C) Imaging optics;

(D) Mechanical scanner movement;

(E) Digital imaging sensor;

(F) Image processing software;

(G) Image composition techniques;

(H) Image file formats;

(I) Image review manipulation software;

(J) Computer environment; and

(K) Display system.

(iii) Detailed bench testing and results at the system level, including for the following, as appropriate:

(A) Color reproducibility;

(B) Spatial resolution;

(C) Focusing test;

(D) Whole slide tissue coverage;

(E) Stitching error; and

(F) Turnaround time.

(iv) Detailed information demonstrating the performance characteristics of the device, including, as appropriate:

(A) Precision to evaluate intra-system and inter-system precision using a comprehensive set of clinical specimens with defined, clinically relevant histologic features from various organ systems and diseases. Multiple whole slide imaging systems, multiple sites, and multiple readers must be included.

(B) Reproducibility data to evaluate inter-site variability using a comprehensive set of clinical specimens with defined, clinically relevant histologic features from various organ systems and diseases. Multiple whole slide imaging systems, multiple sites, and multiple readers must be included.

(C) Data from a clinical study to demonstrate that viewing, reviewing, and diagnosing digital images of surgical pathology slides prepared from tissue slides using the whole slide imaging system is non-inferior to using an optical microscope. The study should evaluate the difference in major discordance rates between manual digital (MD) and manual optical (MO) modalities when compared to the reference (e.g., main sign-out diagnosis).

(D) A detailed human factor engineering process must be used to evaluate the whole slide imaging system user interface(s).

(2) Labeling compliant with 21 CFR 809.10(b) must include the following:

(i) The intended use statement must include the information described in paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section, as applicable, and a statement that reads, “It is the responsibility of a qualified pathologist to employ appropriate procedures and safeguards to assure the validity of the interpretation of images obtained using this device.”

(ii) A description of the technical studies and the summary of results, including those that relate to paragraphs (b)(1)(iii) and (iii) of this section, as appropriate.

(iii) A description of the performance studies and the summary of results, including those that relate to paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section, as appropriate.

(iv) A limiting statement that specifies that pathologists should exercise professional judgment in each clinical situation and examine the glass slides by conventional microscopy if there is doubt about the ability to accurately render an interpretation using this device alone.


Leslie Kux,
Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2017–28262 Filed 12–29–17; 8:45 am]
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