SPECIAL 510(k) SUBSTANTIAL EQUIVALENCE DETERMINATION
DECISION SUMMARY

I Background Information:

A 510(k) Number

K263120

B Applicant

Cepheid

C Proprietary and Established Names

Xpert Xpress CoV-2/Flu plus

D Regulatory Information

Product Code(s)	Classification	Regulation Section	Panel
QOF	Class II	21 CFR 866.3981 - Device To Detect And Identify Nucleic Acid Targets In Respiratory Specimens From Microbial Agents That Cause The SARS Cov-2 Respiratory Infection And Other Microbial Agents When In A Multi-Target Test	MI - Microbiology
OOI	Class II	21 CFR 862.2570 - Instrumentation for clinical multiplex test systems	CH - Clinical Chemistry

II Review Summary:

This 510(k) submission contains information/data on modifications made to the submitter's own CLASS II device requiring 510(k). The following items are present and acceptable.

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 **INDICATIONS FOR USE/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 software modification to mask an analyte**. No new performance data were reviewed.

4. Comparison Information (i.e., similarities and differences) to the submitter's legally marketed predicate device including, labeling, intended use, and physical characteristics.

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.