

SPECIAL 510(k): Device Modification
ODE Review Memorandum (Decision Making Document is Attached)

To: THE FILE

RE: DOCUMENT NUMBER k121445

This 510(k) submission contains information/data on modifications made to the SUBMITTER'S own Class II, Class III or Class I devices requiring 510(k). The following items are present and acceptable (delete/add items as necessary):

1. The name and 510(k) number of the SUBMITTER'S previously cleared device. (For a preamendments device, a statement to this effect has been provided.)
2. Submitter's statement that the **INDICATION/INTENDED USE** of the modified device as described in its labeling **HAS NOT CHANGED** along with the proposed labeling which includes instructions for use, package labeling, and, if available, advertisements or promotional materials (labeling changes are permitted as long as they do not affect the intended use).
3. A description of the device **MODIFICATION(S)**, including clearly labeled diagrams, engineering drawings, photographs, user's and/or service manuals in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the **FUNDAMENTAL SCIENTIFIC TECHNOLOGY** of the modified device **has not changed**.
This change was for:
 - a. Modification of specimen stability claims
 - b. Labeling modifications regarding quality control.
4. **Comparison Information** (similarities and differences) to applicant's legally marketed predicate device including, labeling, intended use, physical characteristics, and performance.

Predicate(s):

K030408 tetraCHROME Reagents

K030828 tetraCXP SYSTEM for Cytomics FC 500 Flow Cytometer with CXP Software

Similarities:

Same Intended Use,

Same operating principle,

Same design (no changes to hardware, software or reagents),

Same reagent shelf life, and

Same material packaging and processes.

Differences:

Claims made in the product labeling for reduced specimen stability.

Claims clarified in the product labeling for prepared sample stability.

5. A **Design Control Activities Summary** which includes:
 - a) Identification of Risk Analysis method(s) used to assess the impact of the modification on the device and its components, and the results of the analysis. The risk analysis method used to assess the impact of the modifications was a Failure Modes and Effects Analysis (FMEA). (See Section 012, Design Controls Activities page 3.)

- b) Based on the Risk Analysis, an identification of the verification and/or validation activities required, including methods or tests used and acceptance criteria to be applied (See Section 012, Design Controls Activities page 3.)
- c) A declaration of conformity with design controls. The declaration of conformity should include:
 - i) A statement signed by the individual responsible, that, as required by the risk analysis, all verification and validation activities were performed by the designated individual(s) and the results demonstrated that the predetermined acceptance criteria were met, and (see Section 014 Declaration of Conformity and Compliance, page 1)
 - ii) A statement signed by the individual responsible, that the manufacturing facility is in conformance with design control procedure requirements as specified in 21 CFR 820.30 and the records are available for review. (see Section 014 Declaration of Conformity and Compliance, page 1.)

6. A Truthful and Accurate Statement, a 510(k) Summary and the Indications for Use Enclosure.

The labeling for this modified subject device has been reviewed to verify that the indication/intended use for the device is unaffected by the modification. In addition, the submitter's description of the particular modification(s) and the comparative information between the modified and unmodified devices demonstrate that the fundamental scientific technology has not changed. The submitter has provided the design control information as specified in The New 510(k) Paradigm and on this basis, I recommend the device be determined substantially equivalent to the previously cleared (or their preamendment) device.