Medical Ethics Case Study

Ethics case study

When are industry-sponsored trials a good match for community doctors?

From the March 2001 *ACP-ASIM Observer*, copyright © 2001 by the American College of Physicians-American Society of Internal Medicine.

This is the 26th in a series of case studies with commentaries by ACP-ASIM's Ethics and Human Rights Committee and Center for Ethics and Professionalism. The series uses hypothetical examples to elaborate on controversial or subtle aspects of issues not addressed in detail in the College's "Ethics Manual" or other position statements.

Case history

Drs. Smith and Jones, senior partners of Internal Medicine Associates, have never before done office-based industry-sponsored drug research. Recently, Dr. Brown from DrugCo invited them to serve as co-investigators in a randomized double-blind clinical trial of a new medication to treat type two diabetes. It is the last trial DrugCo needs to complete before applying for FDA review and approval of the drug.

Rather than going to University Hospital's Institutional Review Board, DrugCo has arranged for a contract research organization (CRO) to manage the whole trial, including institutional review board (IRB) review, study design, data analysis, article preparation and FDA applications.

Subjects who enroll will be randomly selected to receive either one or two doses of the new drug or a placebo for six months. The prospect that some of his patients will get the placebo—not treatment—for that length of time concerns Dr. Smith. Subjects cannot take any other oral drugs for diabetes.

DrugCo will pay the doctors $3,000 per enrolled subject and will pay for all study-related care. In addition, if Drs. Smith and Jones enroll 10 subjects in three months, they will receive an additional $5,000. (Dr. Jones is a bit surprised by the level of these fees and worries about the practice becoming dependent on this kind of income.) Finally, a number of papers will be published from the study and Drs. Smith and Jones are welcome to participate as co-authors.

After taking courses in evidence-based medicine and putting their practice database online, Drs. Smith and Jones are definitely interested in office-based clinical research. They serve an urban population that includes many chronically ill, elderly and low-income patients. They believe that better data is needed to substantiate best practices for this population.

Moreover, the trial is attractive because it promises free medication, and so many of their patients have been hard hit by drug costs. But they want to think through the ramifications before going forward.

Commentary

Drs. Smith and Jones are carefully considering participating in a study in order to advance sound, clinic-based effectiveness research. A decision to participate could affect them, their patients, their patient-physician relationships and their practice.

Physicians who do research involving their patients have a dual role and must be aware of potential conflicts between what is best for the patient-subject and what is optimal for the conduct of the research. However, the lines between clinician and researcher can become fuzzy, as can the lines between patient and subject (1, 2).

Nevertheless, physician-investigators must consider their role as physicians first, and as investigators second, and they should ensure that research they participate in is ethically conducted (3). Therefore, as they consider this opportunity, Drs. Smith and Jones should evaluate the validity and value of the research, the ethical and scientific review that it has undergone, and compensation and authorship issues. We discuss each of these below.

- **Validity.** Drs. Smith and Jones' first consideration should be the study's validity. A study is scientifically valid if it answers the questions that it asks (4).

Medical ethics case study is an essential aspect of modern healthcare that not only informs clinical practices but also shapes the moral framework within which healthcare professionals operate. The complexity of medical scenarios often demands careful consideration of ethical principles, such as autonomy, justice, beneficence, and non-maleficence. This article will explore a relevant medical ethics case study, examining the ethical dilemmas involved, the decision-making process, and the implications for healthcare practice.

Case Overview

In this case study, we will analyze a scenario involving a 27-year-old female patient, Sarah, who has been diagnosed with a rare form of cancer. Sarah is a single mother of two young children and has

been undergoing aggressive treatment, including chemotherapy and radiation. Despite her efforts, her prognosis remains poor, and her oncologist, Dr. Smith, has informed her that palliative care might be the best option moving forward.

Sarah is torn between her desire to fight the illness for her children and the reality of her deteriorating health. She is presented with a clinical trial option for an experimental drug that shows promise but comes with significant risks and side effects. The ethical questions surrounding her situation include whether Dr. Smith should encourage Sarah to pursue the trial, how to respect Sarah’s autonomy, and the implications of her decision on her family.

Ethical Principles in Medical Practice

To understand the complexities of Sarah's case, it is essential to discuss the four fundamental principles of medical ethics:

1. Autonomy

Autonomy refers to the right of patients to make informed decisions about their own healthcare. In Sarah’s case, her ability to understand her condition, the treatment options available, and the potential outcomes are crucial. Respecting her autonomy means providing her with comprehensive information about the experimental drug trial, including its risks and benefits, so she can make an informed choice.

2. Beneficence

Beneficence involves acting in the best interest of the patient. Dr. Smith must weigh the potential benefits of the experimental treatment against its risks. While the trial may offer a chance for improvement, it could also lead to increased suffering or a diminished quality of life for Sarah. Dr. Smith's responsibility includes ensuring that any proposed treatment aligns with Sarah’s best interests.

3. Non-maleficence

Non-maleficence is the principle of "do no harm." In Sarah’s situation, Dr. Smith must consider the potential harm that could arise from recommending the experimental drug. The side effects of the treatment could significantly impact Sarah’s health and well-being, potentially making her condition worse and affecting her ability to care for her children.

4. Justice

Justice refers to fairness and equality in healthcare. Sarah's socioeconomic status, insurance

coverage, and access to care may influence her treatment options. Dr. Smith needs to ensure that Sarah is not disadvantaged due to factors beyond her control and that she receives equitable treatment options.

The Decision-Making Process

The decision-making process in medical ethics often involves multiple steps and considerations. In Sarah's case, the following framework can be applied:

1. Gathering Information

Dr. Smith should collect all relevant information regarding Sarah’s medical history, prognosis, and treatment options. This includes:

- Details of the experimental drug trial, including eligibility requirements, risks, and potential benefits.
- Information about palliative care options and what they entail.
- Support systems available to Sarah, including counseling and family support.

2. Involving the Patient

Dr. Smith must engage Sarah in the decision-making process. This involves:

- Discussing her values and goals regarding her treatment.
- Understanding her fears and concerns about the prognosis.
- Ensuring she feels empowered to ask questions and express her preferences.

3. Weighing Options

Dr. Smith should help Sarah evaluate the available options by discussing:

- The potential benefits of participating in the trial versus the quality of life associated with palliative care.
- The possible risks and side effects of the experimental treatment.
- The long-term implications for her children and family dynamics.

4. Making a Decision

Ultimately, the decision must rest with Sarah. Dr. Smith’s role is to provide guidance and support, ensuring that Sarah feels confident in her choice. This may involve:

- Encouraging a second opinion or consultation with a specialist.

- Providing resources for additional support, such as patient advocacy groups.

Potential Outcomes and Implications

The outcome of Sarah's decision can lead to various implications, both for her and the healthcare system at large.

1. Positive Outcomes

If Sarah chooses to participate in the trial and responds positively to the treatment, several benefits may arise:

- Improved health status and extended life, allowing her to spend more time with her children.
- Contributions to medical knowledge that may benefit future patients with similar conditions.
- Enhanced hope and motivation for other patients facing similar challenges.

2. Negative Outcomes

Conversely, if Sarah experiences adverse effects or does not respond to the treatment, the following consequences may occur:

- Increased physical suffering and emotional distress for Sarah and her family.
- Potential financial strain due to medical costs associated with the trial.
- A sense of guilt or regret if her decision negatively impacts her ability to care for her children.

3. Systemic Implications

Sarah's case also raises broader ethical questions within the healthcare system, including:

- The ethical responsibilities of healthcare providers when discussing experimental treatments.
- The impact of healthcare disparities on patient decision-making and access to trials.
- The importance of ethical guidelines in clinical research and patient care.

Conclusion

Medical ethics is a critical component of healthcare practice, particularly in complex cases like Sarah’s. By examining the principles of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice, healthcare providers can navigate ethical dilemmas and support patients in making informed decisions. The case study of Sarah highlights the importance of patient engagement, informed consent, and the need for compassionate care in the face of challenging medical circumstances. As healthcare continues to evolve, the integration of ethical considerations will remain vital in ensuring

that patients receive respectful, equitable, and holistic care.

Frequently Asked Questions

What are the key principles of medical ethics that should be considered in a case study?

The key principles include autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. These principles guide healthcare professionals in making ethical decisions.

How does patient autonomy influence decision-making in medical ethics case studies?

Patient autonomy emphasizes the right of individuals to make informed decisions about their own healthcare, which must be respected by healthcare providers.

What role does informed consent play in medical ethics?

Informed consent is critical as it ensures that patients are fully aware of the risks and benefits of a treatment, allowing them to make voluntary decisions regarding their care.

How can conflicts of interest affect medical ethics in case studies?

Conflicts of interest can compromise the integrity of medical decisions, leading to biased treatments or recommendations that may not be in the best interest of the patient.

What ethical dilemmas arise in end-of-life care according to medical ethics case studies?

Dilemmas include issues related to euthanasia, the withdrawal of life support, and the determination of quality of life versus prolonging life.

How do cultural differences impact medical ethics case studies?

Cultural differences can influence perceptions of health, illness, and ethics, which may lead to varying expectations and practices regarding patient care and decision-making.

What is the significance of confidentiality in medical ethics?

Confidentiality is vital in maintaining trust between patients and healthcare providers, ensuring that sensitive information is protected and only shared with authorized individuals.

How can utilitarianism be applied in medical ethics case

studies?

Utilitarianism focuses on maximizing overall happiness or well-being, which can guide decisions about resource allocation and treatment options in healthcare settings.

What ethical considerations should be made when conducting medical research?

Ethical considerations include obtaining informed consent, ensuring participant safety, and balancing potential benefits against risks and harms.

How do healthcare disparities relate to medical ethics?

Healthcare disparities raise ethical concerns about justice and equity, highlighting the need for fair access to care and addressing systemic inequalities in health services.

Medical Ethics Case Study

World Health Organization (WHO)
Jul 15, 2025 · The United Nations agency working to promote health, keep the world safe and serve the vulnerable.

International Classification of Diseases (ICD)
This includes lossless mapping of MedDRA (Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities) to facilitate …

Sexual health - World Health Organization (WHO)
3 days ago · Sexual health cannot be defined, understood or made operational without a broad consideration of …

Advice for the public - World Health Organization (WHO)
Mar 18, 2023 · This page includes advice from WHO on ways to protect yourself and prevent the spread of COVID-19. …

Breastfeeding - World Health Organization (WHO)
Jul 21, 2025 · Breastfeeding is the normal way of providing young infants with the nutrients they need for healthy growth …

World Health Organization (WHO)
Jul 15, 2025 · The United Nations agency working to promote health, keep the world safe and serve the vulnerable.

International Classification of Diseases (ICD)
This includes lossless mapping of MedDRA (Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities) to facilitate accurate reporting of drug-related information, embedding medical device …

Sexual health - World Health Organization (WHO)
3 days ago · Sexual health cannot be defined, understood or made operational without a broad consideration of sexuality, which underlies important behaviours and outcomes related to …

Advice for the public - World Health Organization (WHO)
Mar 18, 2023 · This page includes advice from WHO on ways to protect yourself and prevent the spread of COVID-19. The downloadable infographics below provide guidance on general and …

Breastfeeding - World Health Organization (WHO)
Jul 21, 2025 · Breastfeeding is the normal way of providing young infants with the nutrients they need for healthy growth and development. Virtually, all mothers can breastfeed, provided they …

Technical guidance - World Health Organization (WHO)
Collection of WHO technical guidance on COVID-19, updated based on new scientific findings as the epidemic evolves.

Health topics - World Health Organization (WHO)
Marburg virus disease Maternal health Measles Medical devices Medicines Meningitis Micronutrients

Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) Classification
In the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classification system, the active substances are divided into different groups according to the organ or system on which they act and their …

WHO Guidelines
Jul 14, 2025 · The development of global guidelines ensuring the appropriate use of evidence represents one of the core functions of WHO.

Global research on coronavirus disease (COVID-19)
Repository of latest international multilingual scientific findings and knowledge on COVID-19.

Back to Home