

**SPECIAL 510(k): Device Modification  
OIR Decision Memorandum**

**To:** THE FILE

**RE:** DOCUMENT NUMBER K161297

---

This 510(k) submission contains information/data on modifications made to the SUBMITTER'S own Class II 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. **Olympus America, Inc.βeta-2-Microglobulin (K991136). Beckman Coulter has since acquired Olympus America Inc. and is the current 510(k) holder.**
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). The labeling was updated with the current stability changes for on-board stability and calibration frequency. The changes 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. Change in stability claim for on-board stability and calibration frequency.
4. **Comparison Information** (similarities and differences) to applicant's legally marketed predicate device including, labeling, intended use, physical characteristics, and performance studies of the βeta-2-Microglobulin.
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
  - 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

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.