HealthManagement
Promoting Management and Leadership

AI Medical Devices Face Early Recall Risks

Artificial intelligence–enabled medical devices are now a routine feature in clinical practice across the United States. Cleared almost exclusively through the Food and Drug Administration's 510(k) pathway, these products do not require prospective human testing before approval. As a result, many are introduced to the market with little or no direct clinical evaluation. Their rapid spread promises efficiency and precision but also introduces new layers of risk. Recalls undermine both clinician and patient confidence, particularly when failures arise shortly after approval. Recent analysis linking recall patterns with validation status and manufacturer type offers insight into weaknesses in regulatory oversight and the structural pressures that shape device performance once deployed in real-world care.

Recall Patterns and Timing

Among 950 devices assessed, 60 were linked to 182 recalls, covering an estimated 1.7 million units. Diagnostic and measurement errors dominated, with over 900,000 units withdrawn for these reasons alone. Functionality delays and outright failures represented the second most common cause, affecting more than 750,000 units. Physical and biochemical hazards, while less frequent, still removed tens of thousands of products from use. Almost half of all recalls occurred within the first year after market clearance, a rate about double that of medical devices overall cleared through the same regulatory pathway. This clustering of failures in the immediate post-clearance period highlights an important vulnerability in the approval process.

The persistence of unresolved recalls further illustrates the challenges. More than half of the 182 recorded events remained open at the time of reporting, and in some cases problems persisted for more than three years without closure. Kaplan-Meier analysis placed recall-free survival at 96.6% at one year, 93.5% at three years and 91.8% at five years. While most devices therefore remained free of problems, the early concentration of failures created risks that ripple into healthcare delivery, resource allocation and trust in AI-driven tools. Compared with longer-established device categories, this pattern suggests that rapid entry into the market leaves AI-based products particularly exposed to early performance failures.

Role of Clinical Validation

The extent of premarket validation proved critical in shaping recall outcomes. Devices without any reported validation averaged 3.4 recalls each, compared with about two recalls for devices supported by retrospective or prospective clinical evidence. The scale of disruption was also greater for unvalidated devices, which on average saw more than 12,000 units recalled per event. Validated devices averaged roughly half that number. The figures demonstrate that validation is not just a regulatory formality but a practical safeguard against large-scale disruption.

Must Read: ***Fighting Counterfeit Medical Devices***

Lack of validation did not only affect the frequency of recalls but also the depth of their impact. With recalls sometimes involving hundreds of thousands of units, absence of supporting evidence meant that potential weaknesses were not detected until devices were already widely deployed. This not only delayed corrective action but multiplied the consequences for patients and providers. The findings imply that the 510(k) process, while efficient in moving products to market, may be insufficient for technologies whose reliability depends on performance under real-world clinical conditions. The failure to require prospective human trials before approval leaves a significant gap between theoretical functionality and actual clinical performance.

Influence of Manufacturer Type

Patterns of recall were strongly associated with manufacturer type. Publicly traded companies represented just over half of the devices studied

but accounted for more than 90% of recalls and almost all affected units. Smaller public companies stood out as particularly exposed: nearly all recalled products from this group lacked any form of clinical validation. By contrast, private companies contributed a smaller share of recalls, though when their products failed, around 40% also lacked validation.

Multivariable analysis reinforced these associations. Lack of validation carried an odds ratio of 2.8 for recall, while public company status carried an odds ratio of 5.9. Together these findings suggest that structural pressures in public markets, such as investor demand for rapid innovation and accelerated launch timelines, may compromise clinical evaluation. While not the only factor in device reliability, commercial incentives appear to intersect with regulatory gaps, creating a pattern of recalls disproportionately concentrated among publicly traded firms.

The data also highlight unresolved recalls as an ongoing issue. With more than 100 recall events still active at the study's end, many associated with publicly traded manufacturers, health systems may face prolonged uncertainty. For clinicians relying on these technologies, lingering recalls translate into both operational disruption and potential risks to patient safety.

Artificial intelligence–enabled medical devices embody both the promise and pitfalls of rapid digital transformation in healthcare. Their integration into practice has outpaced the regulatory frameworks designed to assure safety. The concentration of recalls in the first year after clearance, the greater risks associated with devices lacking validation, and the disproportionate burden among publicly traded manufacturers reveal structural weaknesses in oversight and commercial practice. The findings suggest that strengthening premarket validation requirements and enhancing postmarket surveillance could help mitigate early performance failures. Reinforcing these safeguards will be critical to maintaining confidence in the role of artificial intelligence within clinical care.

Source: JAMA Health Forum

Image Credit: iStock

Published on : Tue, 2 Sep 2025