



COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO RISK-BASED CLASSIFICATION RULES FOR THE REGULATORY APPROVAL OF MEDICAL DEVICES IN INDIA, THE USA, AND EUROPE

Natesh Gunturu*, M. Akhil¹, N. Venkatesh¹, O. Harika¹, P. Akhila¹.

**Assoc. Professor, Dept of Pharmaceutics, Vikas College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Rayanigudem, Suryapet, Telangana, 508376.*

¹B Pharm IV Year, Vikas College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Rayanigudem, Suryapet, Telangana, 508376.

ABSTRACT

Medical devices are an integral part of modern healthcare and are critical in the diagnosis, prevention, monitoring, treatment, and rehabilitation of diseases. As medical technologies advance, regulatory agencies have established a rigorous system to guarantee that medical devices comply with the necessary safety, quality, and clinical performance criteria before entering the market. Medical device regulation is based on a risk-based classification system, where the level of regulatory control is linked to the potential risk posed by the device. The present study provides a comparative analysis of risk-based classification rules and regulatory approval processes of medical devices in India, the United States (USA), and Europe. It discusses the regulatory structures established by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) under the Medical Devices Rules, 2017, the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) and 21CFR, and the European Union Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR 2017/745).

The study compares the classification systems, regulatory pathways, quality management requirements, clinical evaluation procedures, conformity assessment, and post-market surveillance practices in these regions. The comparative analysis shows that the regulatory systems differ in terms of terminology, classification criteria, and approval procedures, but all have the common objective of ensuring patient safety through risk-based regulation. India classifies medical devices as Class A, B, C, and D; the USA classifies as Class I, II, and III, and Europe classifies as Class I, IIa, IIb, and III, with the regulatory requirements becoming more stringent as the level of risk increases. The study concludes that knowledge of these regulatory structures promotes global regulatory harmonisation, eases international market access, facilitates regulatory compliance, and helps develop safe, effective, and high-quality medical devices for better patient care.

KEYWORDS: Medical Devices, Classification Rules, CDSCO, USFDA, and EMA.

1. INTRODUCTION

Medical devices are essential components of modern health care systems. They are widely used for diagnosis, prevention, monitoring, treatment, and management of diseases. With the increasing complexity and technological advancement of medical devices, the need for robust regulations to ensure the safety, quality, and effectiveness of these devices has become imperative. Medical devices are classified by regulatory authorities according to the level of risk they present for patients and users. A risk-based classification system helps define the level of regulatory control, clinical evidence needed, and the approval process for the market. Various countries have set up their own regulatory systems, with India being overseen by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO), the United States by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and Europe by the European Union Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR 2017/745). All these regions are risk-based, but there are large variations in the classification rules, approval routes, and post-market surveillance requirements. Therefore, it is important to compare these regulatory systems to grasp global medical device regulations and to promote international market access.[1][14][11][12][13]

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. **Sethi and Sethi (2017)** conducted a comparative study of medical device regulations in the USA, the European Union, and India. The authors discussed the regulatory authorities, classification systems, and approval pathways followed in each region. The study highlighted differences in risk-based classification and market authorization procedures. The authors emphasized the role of FDA, EU Notified Bodies, and CDSCO in ensuring device safety and effectiveness. The study concluded that harmonization of regulatory requirements could improve global access to medical devices.[2]



2. **Gupta (2016)** reviewed the current regulatory framework for medical devices across major countries, including the USA, Europe, Japan, India, Brazil, and Australia. The study discussed the increasing complexity of medical devices and the evolution of regulatory requirements to ensure safety and effectiveness. The author highlighted differences in global regulatory systems and emphasized the importance of harmonizing regulations. Participation in the Global Harmonization Task Force (GHTF) was identified as a key step toward regulatory convergence. The study concluded that harmonized medical device regulations can improve access to high-quality, safe, and effective medical devices worldwide.[4]

3. **Lamph (2012)** conducted a review of medical device regulations outside the European Union and reported that different countries adopt varying regulatory approaches while maintaining the common objective of protecting public health. The study emphasized that risk-based classification forms the foundation of medical device regulation and influences the level of regulatory control required for market approval.[5]

4. **Naga Swaroopa et al.** compared medical device regulations in the United States, the European Union, India, and China. The study highlighted that the United States follows a three-tier classification system consisting of Class I, II, and III devices, whereas Europe adopts a four-tier classification system including Class I, IIa, IIb, and III devices. The authors concluded that although regulatory structures differ, all systems are based on risk assessment principles[6]

5. **Bhatt et al.** performed a comparative study of Indian medical device regulations with selected countries and observed that India has significantly strengthened its regulatory framework through the Medical Devices Rules, 2017. The study reported that India's classification system of Class A, B, C, and D aligns closely with international standards and follows principles established by the Global Harmonization Task Force (GHTF) and International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF).[7]

6. **Koth Wala et al.** compared regulatory approaches in India, the United States, and Europe and found that differences exist in regulatory approval pathways, clinical evidence requirements, and post-market surveillance systems. The authors emphasized the importance of regulatory harmonization to reduce barriers for manufacturers seeking access to multiple markets.[8]

7. **Fink and Akra (2023)** compared medical device regulations in the United States and the European Union, focusing on approval pathways and regulatory requirements. The authors highlighted similarities in risk-based classification systems but noted differences in clinical evidence requirements and post-market surveillance activities. The study concluded that the EU MDR imposes more extensive clinical and post-market obligations than the FDA system.[9]

8. **Anjal et al.** presented a comparative overview of medical device classification systems used by major regulatory authorities, including the USA, EU, Japan, Canada, Australia, China, and India. The study highlighted the risk-based classification approaches adopted by different regions and their impact on regulatory requirements and market approval pathways. The authors concluded that global harmonization of classification systems can improve regulatory consistency and facilitate international market access for medical devices.[10]

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

CLASSIFICATION: INDIA

In India, medical devices are governed by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) under the Medical Devices Rules (MDR) 2017. According to the guidelines of the Global Harmonisation Task Force (GHTF), they are classified into four risk classes (Class A, B, C, and D).

The four risk categories:

CLASS A [low risk] Simple, non-invasive equipment.

C: Surgical masks, hot water bottles, elastic bandages, and simple tongue depressors.

Regulation: Self-certified or verified by a Notified Body registered and licensed by the State Licensing Authority (SLA).

CLASS B Devices of lesser contact or effect on health.

EXAMPLE: Wheelchairs, needles, nebulisers, blood pressure monitors.

Regulation: Requires audit by a Notified Body and licensing by SLA.

CLASS C (moderate to high Devices that are invasive or have a fundamental impact on life.

EXAMPLES: Catheters, X-ray machines, ventilators, orthopaedic implants.

Regulation: Must be clinically evaluated and licensed by the Central Licensing Authority (CLA).

Class D High Risk) Devices that support life or are in critical condition.

Examples include pacemakers, heart valves, and implantable defibrillators.

Regulation: stringent requirements for clinical data, licensing by the CLA.



REGULATORY APPROVAL PROCESS OF MEDICAL DEVICES IN INDIA

The process of regulatory approval of medical devices in India is governed by the Medical Devices Rules, 2017, under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940. The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) is the national regulatory authority to regulate the manufacture, import, sale, and distribution of medical devices. The approval process is risk-based, meaning that medical devices are assessed according to their intended use and potential risk before they are marketed.

The regulatory process involves several sequential steps. These include identification of the medical device, risk classification, preparation of technical documentation, submission of the application, regulatory review, inspection (if applicable), grant of licence, and post-market surveillance. Devices that present higher risks will be reviewed more thoroughly than devices that present lower risks to ensure they meet the safety, quality, and performance requirements. The process of total regulatory approval is shown in the following flow chart.[17]

USA

CLASSIFY

In the United States, all medical devices are classified into three different categories (Class I, Class II, and Class III) by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through its Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH) based on the level of risk to patients and users that they pose. From Class I to Class III, regulatory control and premarket scrutiny become more stringent.

Class I (Low Risk) 47% of devices. Requires General Controls." Most are 510(k) exempt. (e.g., bandages, sunglasses).

Class II (Moderate Risk): 43 percent of devices. Requires General and Special Controls 510(k) clearance, typically required. (e.g., syringes, electric wheelchairs).

Class III (High Risk): 10 per cent of devices. Requires Premarket Approval (PMA). Must show safety with clinical data. such as heart valves, pacemakers).

CLASSIFICATION GUIDELINES

The US FDA regulates about 1700 generic device types according to their intended use, indications for use, and risk-based regulation. These 1,700 generic types of devices have been organised by the FDA into 16 medical speciality panels in Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) (Parts 862 through 892). Each generic device type is classified into one of three risk-based regulatory categories. In the USA FDA system, there are no numbered classification rules (e.g., EU MDR Rules 1-22). The devices are categorised into one of three classes (Class I, II, or III) within 16 medical speciality panels (21 CFR Parts 862–892).

The FDA (United States) Regulatory Approval Process for Medical Devices

In the United States, medical devices are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic (FD&C) Act and related regulations in Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (21 CFR). CDRH, the Center for Devices and Radiological Health, is responsible for ensuring the safety and effectiveness of medical devices marketed in the United States.

The FDA's regulatory framework is risk-based and categorises medical devices into Class I, Class II and Class III based on the degree of regulatory control required. Manufacturers must follow one of the regulatory pathways, including 510 (k) Premarket Notification, De Novo Classification, or Premarket Approval (PMA), depending on the device classification.

REGULATORY APPROVAL PROCESS FOR MEDICAL DEVICES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

For regulatory approval in Europe, medical devices must comply with the European Union Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR) 2017/745, which became fully applicable on 26 May 2021. The regulation creates a comprehensive legal framework to ensure that medical devices on the European market meet high standards of quality, safety and clinical performance. Unlike India and the United States, Europe does not have a single regulatory authority for the approval of medical devices. Instead, manufacturers work with designated Notified Bodies (NBs) which perform conformity assessments under the supervision of the competent authorities of EU Member States.

The EU MDR is based on a risk-based classification system, categorising medical devices into Class I, Class IIa, Class IIb and Class III based on 22 classification rules listed in Annex VIII. Depending on the classification of the device, manufacturers will have to prepare technical documentation, carry out clinical evaluations, conformity assessment, CE marking, and fulfil post-market surveillance obligations.

**4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION****TABLE 1: Comparison of Medical Device Classification Systems**

Parameter	India	USA	Europe
Regulatory Authority	CDSCO	FDA	European Commission / Competent Authorities
Applicable Regulation	Medical Devices Rules, 2017	FD&C Act and Medical Device Amendments	EU MDR 2017/745
Classification System	Class A, B, C, D	Class I, II, III	Class I, IIa, IIb, III
Basis of Classification	Risk-based	Risk-based	Risk-based
Lowest Risk Class	Class A	Class I	Class I
Moderate Risk Class	Class B	Class II	Class IIa
Moderate-High Risk Class	Class C	-	Class IIb
Highest Risk Class	Class D	Class III	Class III
Classification Criteria	Intended use, invasiveness, duration of contact, 16 classification rules	Intended use, risk, and regulatory controls	Intended use, invasiveness, duration, and 22 classification rules

TABLE 2: Comparison of Regulatory Approval Pathways

Parameter	India	USA	Europe
Regulatory Body	CDSCO	FDA	Notified Body
Low-Risk Device Approval	Registration/Licensing	General Controls	Self-declaration/CE Marking
Moderate-Risk Device Approval	Technical Documentation Review	510(k) Submission	Conformity Assessment
High-Risk Device Approval	Detailed Technical Review and Clinical Evidence	PMA Approval	Clinical Evaluation and Notified Body Assessment
Quality System Requirement	ISO 13485	QMSR/21 CFR Part 820	ISO 13485
Post-Market Surveillance	Mandatory	Mandatory	Mandatory

TABLE 3: Comparison of Risk-Based Classification Rules

Parameter	India	USA	Europe
Number of Classes	4	3	4
Classification Method	16 Classification Rules	Device Panels and Regulatory Controls	22 Classification Rules
Non-invasive Devices	Class A/B	Class I/II	Class I/IIa
Invasive Devices	Class B/C/D	Class II/III	Class IIa/IIb/III
Implantable Devices	Class C/D	Class III	Class III
Life-Supporting Devices	Class D	Class III	Class III
Duration of Use Considered	Yes	Yes	Yes
Intended Use Considered	Yes	Yes	Yes

TABLE 4: DISCUSSION TABLE

Aspect	India	USA	Europe
Classification Approach	Four-tier risk system	Three-tier risk system	Four-tier risk system
Regulatory Maturity	Developing and harmonizing	Highly established	Highly established
Approval Complexity	Moderate to High	High	High
International Harmonization	IMDRF aligned	IMDRF participant	IMDRF participant
Patient Safety Focus	High	Very High	Very High



Device	India Rule	USA Panel/CFR	Europe Rule	Main Reason for Classification
Surgical Gloves	Rule 1	21 CFR 878	Rule 1	Non-invasive, low patient risk
Hypodermic Needle	Rule 5	21 CFR 880	Rule 6	Short-term invasive device
Orthopedic Bone Plate	Rule 8	21 CFR 888	Rule 8	Long-term implantable device
Coronary Stent	Rule 8	21 CFR 870	Rule 8	Implantable cardiovascular device with high risk

5. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis found that India, the United States, and Europe have a risk-based approach for classification and regulatory approval of medical devices. However, the classification methodology and regulatory pathways are different in these regions. India and Europe have four-tier classification systems, while the United States has a three-tier classification system. Medical Devices in India are classified as Class A, B, C, and D under the Medical Devices Rules, 2017, whereas in the United States, devices are classified as Class I, II, and III based on the level of regulatory control required and assigned to specific FDA medical speciality panels. In Europe, medical devices are classified into Class I, IIa, IIb, and III following the 22 classification rules detailed in Annex VIII of EU MDR 2017/745.

Although they are divergent, the three regulatory regimes all have the common goal of ensuring that the level of regulatory scrutiny is higher, the higher the potential risk associated with the device. Lower-risk devices are subject to less stringent regulatory requirements, whereas higher-risk devices require more detailed technical documentation, clinical evidence, conformity assessment or premarket review, and post-market surveillance. The European regulatory framework provides specific classification rules and relies on conformity assessment through Notified Bodies. The FDA focuses on regulatory pathways such as 510(k), De Novo, and Premarket Approval (PMA). The introduction of the Medical Devices Rules, 2017, has transformed the regulatory landscape in India, bringing the risk-based classification system in line with globally accepted principles and strengthening the regulatory oversight. To summarise, the comparative analysis shows that, although the regulatory approaches are different, the main objective of all three systems is to ensure the safety, quality, performance and efficacy of medical devices, while ensuring their timely availability to patients.

6. SUMMARY

Medical devices are critical components of the modern healthcare system that assist in the diagnosis, prevention, monitoring, treatment, and management of diseases and medical conditions. These range from simple devices such as thermometers, surgical gloves, and syringes to complex devices such as pacemakers, coronary stents, imaging systems, and implantable devices. Medical devices have a direct impact on patient health and safety and are therefore subject to regulation in the pre-market and post-market phases. Regulatory bodies worldwide have implemented a risk-based classification system for medical devices to ensure the devices meet the necessary safety, quality, and performance requirements.

The current study involves a comparative analysis of risk-based classification rules and regulatory approval requirements for medical devices in India, the United States, and Europe. Collectively, these three regions are among the largest and most influential medical device markets in the world and have built out robust regulatory systems for the regulation of medical devices. While all three systems are risk-based, there are differences in classification criteria, approval pathways, clinical evidence requirements, and post-market surveillance procedures.

In India, the regulation of medical devices falls under the Medical Devices Rules, 2017, by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). The Indian regulatory system has classified medical devices into four categories, namely Class A (low risk), Class B (low-moderate risk), Class C (moderate-high risk), and Class D (high risk). The classification is based on sixteen classification rules defined according to the intended use, the invasiveness, the contact time with the body, and the potential risk for patients. The introduction of the Medical Devices Rules, 2017, has immensely strengthened the Indian regulatory framework and aligned it with internationally accepted regulatory practices.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates medical devices in the United States. The FDA places devices into three different classes: Class I, Class II, and Class III. The classification is based on the degree of regulatory control needed to assure the safety and effectiveness of the device. Devices in Class I are subject to general controls, Class II devices require special controls and usually go through the 510(k) path, while Class III devices generally require Premarket Approval (PMA) due to their higher risk. The FDA system is one of the most mature and advanced regulatory systems in the world.



In Europe, medical devices are regulated by the European Union Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR 2017/745). There are four classes of devices: Class I, Class IIa, Class IIb, and Class III. The classification process takes into account the invasiveness, duration of use, intended purpose, and whether the device is active or implantable. Twenty-two classification rules are used. Compared to the previous directives, the EU MDR has more stringent requirements for clinical evaluation, conformity assessment, and post-market surveillance, which enhance patient safety and regulatory transparency.

The comparative analysis showed that although the terminology and classification structures differed, all three regulatory systems followed the basic principle that the higher the risk of the device, the greater the regulatory control. India and Europe utilise a four-tier classification system, while the United States employs a three-tier system. The more stringent the regulatory approval process, the greater the risk of the device. All regions demand extensive technical documentation, clinical evidence, quality management system compliance, and ongoing post-market surveillance for high-risk devices.

The study also notes the growing trend towards international regulatory harmonisation through bodies such as the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF) and the adoption of international standards such as ISO 13485 and ISO 14971. Harmonisation efforts are aimed at reducing regulatory barriers, expanding market access and improving patient safety, while encouraging innovation in the medical device sector.

To summarise, the regulation of medical devices and the regulatory approval are based on the risk-based classification systems of India, the US, and Europe. Classification rules and approval pathways may differ, but all three regulatory structures aim to ensure the safety, quality, and effectiveness of medical devices. The findings of this study provide useful information about similarities and differences of global regulatory systems and may assist regulatory professionals, manufacturers, researchers, and policymakers to better understand and deal with medical device regulations.

7. CONCLUSION

The present study evaluated the risk-based classification rules and the regulatory approval requirements of medical devices in India, the United States, and Europe. The findings demonstrated that all three regions have a risk-based approach to ensure the safety, quality, and effectiveness of medical devices. India and Europe use a four-tier classification system, while the United States uses a three-tier classification system. The criteria for classification differ, as do the regulatory pathways and the approval procedures. All regulatory systems apply stricter controls to devices that pose a higher risk. The study also found that the regulatory framework in India has undergone significant changes and is heading towards international standards. Overall, the comparative analysis points out the need for regulatory harmonisation to facilitate access to global markets, reduce regulatory burden, and provide assurance to patients. Future additional international harmonisation of medical device regulations could increase efficiency and promote innovation in the medical device industry.

8. REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Medical devices. Available from: <https://www.who.int/health-topics/medical-devices> (Accessed: Date of access).
2. Sethi R, Sethi S. Medical Devices Regulation in the United States of America, European Union and India: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Regulatory Affairs*. 2017;6(1):1-6.
3. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). Official Website. Available from: <https://cdsco.gov.in> (Accessed: Date of access).
4. Gupta SK. Medical Device Regulations: A Current Perspective. *Journal of Young Pharmacists*. 2016;8(1):6-11.
5. Lamph S. Regulation of Medical Devices Outside the European Union. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 2012;105(1):12-15.
6. Naga Swaroopa P, et al. A Comparative Study of Medical Devices and Their Regulations in the US, EU, India and China.
7. Bhatt D, et al. Comparative Study of Indian Medical Device Regulations with Selected Countries.
8. Koth Wala D, et al. Regulatory Approaches to Medical Devices: A Comparison Between India, the USA and Europe.
9. Fink M, Akra B. Comparison of the International Regulations for Medical Devices – USA versus Europe. *Injury*. 2023;54(Suppl 3): S109-S113.
10. Anjal K, Natarajan J, Rao RP, Khanra S, Gangadhar Appa HV, Netravathi P. Medical Device Classification Systems Across Major Regulatory Authorities: A Comparative Overview. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research*. 2025;17(4):85-89.
11. Government of India. Medical Devices Rules, 2017. Available from: <https://cdsco.gov.in> (Accessed: Date of access).
12. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Medical Device Exemptions 510(k) and GMP Requirements. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov> (Accessed: Date of access).



SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863 | ISI I.F. Value: 1.241 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)

EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)

Volume: 11 | Issue: 7 | July 2026

- Peer Reviewed Journal

13. *European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on Medical Devices. Available from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu> (Accessed: Date of access).*
14. *International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF). Available from: <https://www.imdrf.org> (Accessed: Date of access).*
15. *International Organization for Standardization. ISO 13485:2016 – Medical Devices – Quality Management Systems. Available from: <https://www.iso.org> (Accessed: Date of access).*
16. *International Organization for Standardization. ISO 14971:2019 – Medical Devices – Application of Risk Management to Medical Devices. Available from: <https://www.iso.org> (Accessed: Date of access).*
17. *Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. Medical Devices Rules and Guidance Documents. Available from: <https://cdsco.gov.in> (Accessed: Date of access).*
18. *U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Classify Your Medical Device. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices> (Accessed: Date of access).*