**International Journal of Advance and Innovative Research**
Volume 13, Issue 3: July - September 2026
ISSN 2394 - 7780

# AI-ENABLED REGULATORY MONITORING OF 3D PRINTED MEDICAL DEVICES IN INDIA: A FEASIBILITY STUDY OF CDSCO READINESS AND DIGITAL COMPLIANCE

**Prashant Gogia[1] and Dr Sunil Kumar[2]**
[1]Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Jagannath University, Delhi NCR, Bahadurgarh
[2]Assistant Professor & Research Supervisor, Faculty of Law, Jagannath University, Delhi NCR, Bahadurgarh

## ABSTRACT
Three-dimensional printing is reshaping medical-device production by enabling patient-specific implants, prosthetics, anatomical models, surgical guides, dental devices and other customised healthcare products. The regulatory difficulty is that safety no longer depends only on the finished product. It depends on a linked digital and manufacturing chain involving imaging data, design files, software versions, material quality, printer calibration, post-processing, sterilisation and clinical use. This paper examines whether artificial intelligence can be integrated into India's medical-device regulatory system to support monitoring of 3D printed medical devices. It applies doctrinal legal analysis, regulatory mapping and policy feasibility assessment to Indian medical-device law, CDSCO public infrastructure, materiovigilance, data protection, AI ethics and comparative regulatory guidance. The paper finds that India has a basic legal and digital foundation for AI-assisted monitoring, but it lacks an additive-manufacturing-specific lifecycle compliance model. It recommends a phased CDSCO approach based on structured data fields, validated AI tools, human regulatory supervision, audit trails, cybersecurity controls and digital device passports for higher-risk and patient-specific devices.

**Keywords:** 3D printed medical devices; CDSCO; artificial intelligence; regulatory monitoring; Medical Devices Rules, 2017; digital compliance; materiovigilance; device passport.

## 1. INTRODUCTION
Additive manufacturing has moved medical-device production from standardised batches towards patient-specific and software-dependent production. A device may begin from CT, MRI or intraoral-scan data, pass through segmentation and computer-aided design, be printed through a specific machine and material batch, and then undergo cleaning, curing, finishing, inspection, packaging and sterilisation. The regulatory object is therefore not merely a printed device. It is a lifecycle record of digital, material and clinical decisions.[1]

In India, medical devices are regulated under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and the Medical Devices Rules, 2017. CDSCO's public medical-device materials state that all medical devices are regulated under that framework. This existing framework creates the legal base for oversight, but it was not designed around machine-readable lifecycle data or AI-supported monitoring of patient-specific additive manufacturing.[2]

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW
Medical literature treats 3D printing as a major healthcare technology because it supports anatomical models, surgical planning, prosthetics, implants and other personalised applications. Aimar, Palermo and Innocenti describe the technology as a state-of-the-art medical tool. Ventola separately records current and projected medical uses across prosthetics, implants, tissues, pharmaceutical research and education. This literature establishes clinical relevance, but it does not answer the Indian regulatory question of how CDSCO should monitor lifecycle compliance after market entry.[3]

Legal literature on 3D printing in India has examined liability, intellectual property and broader legal risk. However, the specific intersection of CDSCO digital readiness, AI-assisted monitoring and 3D printed medical devices remains underdeveloped. Comparative regulatory material from the United States FDA is useful because it identifies design, manufacturing, material, post-processing and testing considerations for additive manufactured devices, but it is not binding in India.[4]

---

[1]Anna Aimar, Augusto Palermo and Bernardo Innocenti, 'The Role of 3D Printing in Medical Applications: A State of the Art' (2019) Journal of Healthcare Engineering, Article ID 5340616 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/5340616>

[2]Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation, 'Medical Device & Diagnostics' (CDSCO) <https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Medical-Device-Diagnostics/Medical-Device-Diagnostics/>

[3] C Lee Ventola, 'Medical Applications for 3D Printing: Current and Projected Uses' (2014) 39(10) Pharmacy and Therapeutics 704 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25336867/>

[4]Shardha Rajam and Adya Jha, '3D Printing: An Analysis of Liabilities and Potential Benefits within the Indian Legal Framework' (2018) 11 NUJS Law Review 3 <https://nujslawreview.org/2018/12/01/3d-printing-an-analysis-of-liabilities-and-potential-benefits-within-the-indian-legal-framework/>

ISSN 2394 - 7780

## 3. RESEARCH GAP

The main research gap is the absence of a dedicated Indian lifecycle compliance model for AI-enabled monitoring of 3D printed medical devices. Existing Indian medical-device law can regulate the device, but public sources do not show a structured CDSCO mechanism that links patient-specific design history, printer parameters, material records, quality-system evidence, adverse-event reporting and AI-generated risk signals. This gap matters because additive manufacturing failures may be process-specific rather than batch-specific.[1]

## 4. OBJECTIVES

The objectives are: first, to identify why 3D printed medical devices create digital-compliance challenges; second, to assess the visible readiness of CDSCO and connected Indian regulatory mechanisms for AI-assisted monitoring; third, to propose a lifecycle digital-compliance model; and fourth, to identify safeguards required for lawful, accountable and human-supervised AI use.

## 5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The paper asks: (i) what characteristics of 3D printed medical devices make AI-assisted monitoring relevant; (ii) what Indian legal and institutional foundations already support such monitoring; (iii) what gaps remain in CDSCO-facing digital compliance; and (iv) what phased regulatory model can India adopt without replacing human legal and scientific judgment?

## 6. METHODOLOGY

The paper adopts doctrinal legal analysis and policy feasibility assessment. It reviews Indian legislation and regulatory materials, CDSCO public resources, MvPI materials, ISO medical-device standards, data-protection law, AI ethics guidance, and comparative FDA and WHO guidance. The study is non-empirical. It does not claim access to internal CDSCO systems, confidential regulatory data, budgets, staffing capacity or unpublished software architecture.

## 7. REGULATORY AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Medical Devices Rules, 2017 use a risk-based regulatory structure for medical devices and prescribe licensing, quality-management, testing, labelling and post-market obligations. This structure is capable of accommodating additive manufacturing in principle because risk can be assessed by intended use, invasiveness, duration of contact and patient-safety consequence. However, additive manufacturing introduces process risks that ordinary product descriptions may not capture, including design-file versioning, machine calibration, material reuse, build orientation and post-processing control.[2]

The MvPI framework provides an adverse-event reporting pathway for medical devices. For 3D printed devices, PMS information should be more granular than ordinary complaint reporting. It should capture design family, material lot, printer technology, sterilisation method, defect type, revision surgery, CAPA outcome and whether any AI-assisted inspection or monitoring tool was used. IMDRF adverse-event terminology may assist coding consistency where India chooses to harmonise reporting vocabulary.[3]

## 8. ANALYSIS: CDSCO READINESS AND LIFECYCLE COMPLIANCE

CDSCO readiness may be assessed through visible public indicators: a statutory medical-device framework, classification resources, online application mechanisms, notified body and testing-laboratory information, and public regulatory guidance. These are meaningful starting points. They do not, however, prove readiness for AI-enabled lifecycle monitoring. That requires structured datasets, interoperable records, sectoral validation protocols, cybersecurity controls, audit logs and trained regulatory personnel.

| Compliance element | Present position | Gap | Corrective direction |
|---|---|---|---|
| Legal authority | Medical devices are regulated under Indian law. | No AM-specific AI monitoring pathway is visible in public materials. | Issue CDSCO guidance under the existing framework. |

[1]Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Medical Devices Rules 2017, Gazette of India, GSR 78(E) (31 January 2017), available through CDSCO <https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Acts-and-rules/Medical-Devices-Rules/> .

[3]Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission, Guidance Document for Medical Devices: Materiovigilance Programme of India (2018) <https://ipc.gov.in/images/mvpi/Guidance_Document.pdf> .

ISSN 2394 - 7780

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Digital data | Online regulatory resources exist. | Lifecycle AM fields are not sufficiently granular. | Create machine-readable fields for design, material, printer and PMS data. |
| Quality system | Quality and risk-management standards provide regulatory logic. | AM-specific process controls need clearer translation. | Adopt an AM QMS checklist and risk-file linkage. |
| Post-market surveillance | MvPI provides an adverse-event route. | AM failure taxonomy is underdeveloped. | Add AM-specific adverse-event and CAPA fields. |
| AI governance | General AI-health guidance exists. | CDSCO-specific AI validation SOP is not publicly visible. | Pilot validated, auditable and human-supervised tools. |

The central proposal is a digital device passport for higher-risk and patient-specific 3D printed medical devices. The passport should contain device identity, intended use, risk class, licence status, design history, software version, material specification, printer identity, build parameters, validation evidence, quality-release decision, post-market complaints, CAPA records and recall linkages. AI should read this record to identify missing evidence, inconsistent claims, repeated adverse events, process drift and risk clusters. It should not issue final legal decisions.

## 9. DISCUSSION

AI-enabled monitoring is feasible only if it is treated as regulatory support rather than regulatory substitution. A system that flags incomplete technical dossiers, repeated failure patterns or unusually delayed CAPA action can strengthen CDSCO and MvPI decision-making. A system that makes opaque licensing, recall or inspection decisions would weaken procedural fairness and accountability. Human review, reasons, appealability and record preservation are therefore legal safeguards, not administrative preferences.[1]

Data protection is a second safeguard. Patient-specific printing may use imaging data and design files capable of identifying or re-identifying individuals. The DPDP Act and Rules therefore matter when personal data is processed digitally. Digital compliance should follow purpose limitation, access control, data minimisation, retention discipline, security safeguards and auditable transfer rules.[2]

## 10. ADDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX

For regulatory use, the proposed model may be translated into four implementation stages. At the first stage, CDSCO may identify a minimum dataset for additive manufactured medical devices, including intended use, risk class, design history, material record, printer identity, post-processing, sterilisation and complaint linkage. At the second stage, manufacturers and hospitals may be asked to maintain the dataset in a standardised digital format. At the third stage, AI tools may be piloted only for administrative screening, such as missing-field detection, inconsistent classification flags and adverse-event clustering. At the fourth stage, validated tools may support risk-based inspection planning, but only where the regulator records independent reasons for accepting or rejecting the AI alert.

This staged approach avoids two errors. It does not treat AI as a substitute regulator, and it does not reject AI merely because the legal framework is not yet technology-specific. The proper legal standard is controlled assistance. A regulator may use software to organise evidence, but the legal decision must remain reviewable, reasoned and attributable to an authorised human authority.

## 11. ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTION TO LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP

The paper contributes to legal scholarship by shifting the debate from whether India should regulate 3D printing to how existing medical-device law can be made digitally enforceable. The proposed lifecycle device passport connects doctrinal legal duties with technical evidence. It also creates a bridge between CDSCO licensing,

[1]World Health Organization, Regulatory Considerations on Artificial Intelligence for Health (WHO, 19 October 2023) <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240078871> .

[2]Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023, No 22 of 2023 (India Code) <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/22037?view_type=browse> ; Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025 <https://www.meity.gov.in/documents/act-and-policies/digital-personal-data-protection-rules-2025-gDOxUjMtQWa?pageTitle=Digital-Personal-Data-Protection-Rules-2025> .

ISSN 2394 - 7780

MvPI reporting, manufacturer quality systems and patient-specific risk. This contribution is narrower than a general AI-health paper and more legally focused than a technical additive-manufacturing review.

## 12. RECOMMENDATIONS

CDSCO should issue an additive-manufacturing concept note, followed by guidance on lifecycle records for higher-risk 3D printed devices. MvPI forms should include AM-specific fields for design, printer, material, sterilisation, defect mode and CAPA. CDSCO should pilot AI only for low-risk administrative functions at first, such as completeness checks and anomaly alerts. Any later use for inspection prioritisation or post-market signal detection should require validation, bias testing, audit logs, cybersecurity review and human approval.

## 13. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SCOPE

This paper relies on public legal and regulatory sources. It does not assess internal CDSCO data systems, staffing, budgets or unpublished software projects. Future research should include interviews with regulators, manufacturers, hospitals, notified bodies and software developers. Empirical studies should test whether AI completeness checks and adverse-event clustering improve regulatory speed, accuracy and accountability.

## 14. CONCLUSION

India can integrate AI-enabled regulatory monitoring for 3D printed medical devices without creating an entirely new regulator. The existing medical-device framework, CDSCO infrastructure, MvPI, quality standards and AI ethics materials provide a foundation. The missing element is a structured lifecycle compliance model designed for additive manufacturing. A phased, validated and human-supervised digital device passport can help India monitor patient-specific devices more effectively while preserving legal accountability, patient safety and regulatory fairness.

## REFERENCES

1. Anna Aimar, Augusto Palermo and Bernardo Innocenti, 'The Role of 3D Printing in Medical Applications: A State of the Art' (2019) Journal of Healthcare Engineering, Article ID 5340616 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/5340616> accessed 29 June 2026.
2. Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation, 'Medical Device & Diagnostics' (CDSCO) <https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Medical-Device-Diagnostics/Medical-Device-Diagnostics/> accessed 29 June 2026.
3. C Lee Ventola, 'Medical Applications for 3D Printing: Current and Projected Uses' (2014) 39(10) Pharmacy and Therapeutics 704 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25336867/> accessed 29 June 2026.
4. Shardha Rajam and Adya Jha, '3D Printing: An Analysis of Liabilities and Potential Benefits within the Indian Legal Framework' (2018) 11 NUJS Law Review 3 <https://nujslawreview.org/2018/12/01/3d-printing-an-analysis-of-liabilities-and-potential-benefits-within-the-indian-legal-framework/> accessed 29 June 2026.
5. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Medical Devices Rules 2017, Gazette of India, GSR 78(E) (31 January 2017), available through CDSCO <https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Acts-and-rules/Medical-Devices-Rules/> accessed 29 June 2026.
6. Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission, Guidance Document for Medical Devices: Materiovigilance Programme of India (2018) <https://ipc.gov.in/images/mvpi/Guidance_Document.pdf> accessed 29 June 2026.
7. World Health Organization, Regulatory Considerations on Artificial Intelligence for Health (WHO, 19 October 2023) <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240078871> accessed 29 June 2026.
8. Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023, No 22 of 2023 (India Code) <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/22037?view_type=browse> accessed 29 June 2026; Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Digital Personal Data Protection Rules 2025 <https://www.meity.gov.in/documents/act-and-policies/digital-personal-data-protection-rules-2025-gDOxUjMtQWa?pageTitle=Digital-Personal-Data-Protection-Rules-2025> accessed 29 June 2026.