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**1. Purpose & Overview**

This document highlights the current alignment between our AI-assisted 510(k) analysis process and the **initial research goals** established in late 2024. It also details **reasons for any recent changes** to synergy weighting, negative factor assignments, or other logic modifications implemented as of December 24, 2024.

**2. Alignment with Initial Research**

1. **Core Methodology**
   * We continue to apply the same synergy rule set:
     + **+0.15** if Advisory Committee (AC) is **OR** or **NE** *and* the device keywords (KW) include any from {Bone, Spinal, Implant, Fusion, etc.}.
   * We preserve negative factor rules:
     + **−2.0** for purely cosmetic devices.
     + **−0.20** for purely diagnostic software.
   * All weighting pillars (AC, PC, KW, ST, PT, GL, NF, synergy) remain consistent with prior versions.
2. **Spreadsheet-Ready Output**
   * Per initial research requirements, each 510(k) record is still presented in a **single-line Markdown row** to facilitate quick copy/paste into spreadsheets.
   * All synergy details, disclaimers, and notes continue to appear in the final columns without mid-cell line breaks.
3. **Category Determination**
   * Category thresholds (High, Moderate, Low, Almost None) remain based on final percentage score cutoffs set earlier in 2024 (e.g., >60% → High, etc.).
   * This aligns with the initial research objective to have quick snapshot categories for decision-making.

**3. Reasons for Changes**

1. **Extended Keyword Set**
   * In Q4 of 2024, **“Syndesmosis”** and **“Ankle”** were added as additional bone-related keywords, thus eligible for synergy if AC=OR or NE. This followed new clinical feedback indicating certain foot/ankle systems are heavily bone-related.
   * These changes aim to **increase precision** in scoring orthopedic devices.
2. **Clarified Cosmetic vs. Aesthetic**
   * Late 2024 clarifications from the FDA guidelines suggest that devices marketed for *non-medical* hair removal or similar cosmetic outcomes remain subject to **−2.0 negative factor**. However, certain hair growth or scalp stimulation devices are not always “purely cosmetic,” so no automatic penalty is applied unless disclaimers confirm purely cosmetic use.
3. **Diagnostic Software Clarification**
   * Additional disclaimers ensure we only apply the **−0.20** negative factor if the device is *purely* diagnostic software without direct therapeutic intervention.
   * This revision helps **avoid over-penalizing** multi-function software that combines both diagnostic and interactive/therapeutic features.
4. **Local/Regional Variation**
   * **GL (Geographic Location)** remains at 0.60 for US-based operations, 0.50 for many other regions, consistent with original weighting. Some new local variations have been proposed, but **no final changes** have been adopted at this time.

**4. Ongoing Monitoring**

* We maintain an **internal audit** of synergy triggers, negative factor applications, and borderline cases (e.g., partial aesthetic vs. partial functional devices).
* The team regularly reviews each new 510(k) record to ensure **transparent** synergy or penalty decisions.

**5. Conclusion**

As of **December 24, 2024**, our AI-driven 510(k) analysis platform remains closely aligned with **initial research** while incorporating **minor enhancements** for accuracy and clarity. Changes have been made only where new clinical or regulatory insights arose, ensuring that synergy rules, negative factor logic, and category thresholds remain **robust and traceable**.

**Contact for Further Inquiries**  
Please reach out to the Regulatory Data Analytics Team or the Medical AI Steering Committee for any clarifications on synergy weighting, negative factors, or next-phase improvements.
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