

Psychiatric Ethics (Oxford Medical Publications)

BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY (2001), 178, 397-398

EDITORIAL

Informed consent in psychiatric research

TEIFION DAVIES

Research is the life blood of a clinical discipline, and it is arguable that psychiatry's expanding empirical base has been an important factor in gaining equal status with the traditional medical disciplines. In common with research involving children and other vulnerable groups, psychiatry faces particular obstacles in establishing an ethical framework for informed consent that inspires confidence in patients who participate in research (Adshead, 1996; Doyal, 1997; Goodare & Lockwood, 1999). Despite existing guidelines (Medical Research Council, 1991; General Medical Council, 1999) there is a widespread perception among patients that research is not done for them but done to them for the benefit of the researchers (Mental Health Foundation, 2000; Smith, 2000). It is clear that for psychiatric research to continue to flourish we must create conditions under which patients wish to participate in research from which they might not benefit personally, and whose results are not predictable and might not be known for many years. What are these conditions and how should we promote them?

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

Ethical conditions for psychiatric research derive from general moral principles of justice (Rawls, 1976) and respect for rights (Dworkin, 1992) and they are, therefore, qualitatively similar to those that apply to therapeutic treatment of patients (Davies, 1997; Doyal, 1997). It has been argued that because psychiatric patients might not benefit from research in which they participate, psychiatric research involves a separate set of ethical conditions from treatment (Adshead, 1996). This view cannot be sustained, since, taken to its limits, it implies a hazardous moral relativism in which circumstances rather than principles determine which ethical rules should be applied. The primary condition

for ethical psychiatric research (as for treatment) is the duty to respect the patient's autonomy to exercise his or her rights as a moral agent (Dworkin, 1992). Specifically, a patient's right to grant or withhold consent to participate in research is infringed if he or she is denied the conditions necessary for his or her exercise of information (Osborn, 1999); trust (Davies, 1997); lack of coercion (Wing, 1999); and respect for previously stated wishes about future events ("advance directives"; British Medical Association, 1995). For the individuals asked to participate in psychiatric research, information remains the keystone of informed consent (Osborn, 1999). A patient or participant has a right not to be denied such information as necessary to allow him or her to come to a reasoned decision, including information that does justice to the uncertainties inherent in medical and scientific knowledge (General Medical Council, 1999; Wing, 1999). A participant in a double-blind trial cannot be told precisely what treatment he or she will receive, but he or she ought to be told the chances of receiving each of the treatments, and their predicted benefits and adverse effects. Moreover, using appropriate "decision aids" can assist the patient without increasing his or her anxieties (O'Connor *et al.*, 1999). Where patients are invited to participate in non-therapeutic studies researchers have a duty to make clear the aims of the research and to ensure that participants are aware that they may not benefit personally (Medical Research Council, 1991; Doyal, 1997).

PARTNERSHIP IN RESEARCH

Information is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for ethical research: the context of information-giving is also important (Charles *et al.*, 2000). Patients cannot be expected to grant consent to researchers they cannot trust, and trust can only

flourish where there is mutual respect (Davies, 1997): from a respect for the patient's autonomy arises a partnership between patient and researcher (Coulter, 1999). Increasingly, patients and their carers are asserting their desire for partnership in all stages of the research process, beginning with the choice of questions to be asked in research (Mental Health Foundation, 2000). Formulating research questions from the views of patients themselves (termed "experts by experience" by the Mental Health Foundation), involving patients in the design and monitoring of ongoing projects, and sharing results of research are important steps in regaining the trust of those invited to participate in research. National organisations such as the Medical Research Council are already formalising this process by setting up consumer liaison groups to advise on their activities, and it is likely that in future clinical researchers will be required to demonstrate that their research proposals have the backing of patients.

Partnership in research is a necessity if ethical research is not to wither away for lack of willing participants. The process of influencing hearts and minds should work in both directions: researchers, patients and carers must find ways of engaging with each other to share their ideas and facilitate the progress of the research they support. Researchers can facilitate the process by promoting discussions with patient groups, and by placing high-quality, unbiased information on mental disorders on the internet. Patients may agree to join monitoring committees, to be included in case registers, or to carry donor cards specifying the conditions under which they would or would not participate in research. The test of whether this partnership works will be that patients should want to participate in research, from self-interest or altruism, as an expression of their personal autonomy (cf. Timuss, 1973; Rawls, 1976).

OVERCOMING DIFFICULTIES IN PSYCHIATRIC RESEARCH

Research with some groups of psychiatric patients poses additional problems that must be overcome if these patients are not to be disenfranchised therapeutic orphans (Adshead, 1996; Wing, 1999). For at least some of the time some patients will lack the capacity to grant informed consent (Osborn, 1999). Grounds have been proposed for

397

Ethical issues are pivotal to the practice of psychiatry. Anyone involved in psychiatric practice and mental healthcare has to be aware of the range of ethical .Psychiatric Ethics (Oxford Medical Publications): Medicine & Health Science Books @ mydietdigest.comBuy Psychiatric Ethics (Oxford Medical Publications) 3 by Sidney Bloch, Paul Chodoff, Stephen A. Green (ISBN:) from Amazon's Book Store.Buy Psychiatric Ethics (Oxford Medical Publications) 2nd Revised edition by Sidney Bloch, Paul Chodoff (ISBN:) from Amazon's Book Store.Yet with few exceptions, psychiatric ethics has generally been regarded as an New Oxford Textbook of Psychiatry (2 ed.) Print Publication Date: Feb Oxford: Oxford University Press, the relevance of bioethics (of which medical ethics and journal are familiar, are considered to be fundamental.This is the manuscript of a chapter that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in The Oxford Handbook of Psychiatric Ethics, Volume 1 .Psychiatric ethics / edited by Sidney Bloch and Paul Chodoff Bloch, Sidney Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, - Oxford medical publications.Dr Gwen Adshead, MBBS, MRCPsych, MA (Medical Law and Ethics) S Bloch, P Chodoff, S Agreen, Oxford, Oxford University Press, , psychiatric literature and is shamefully neglected in mental health practice in this country.Authors and Editors. John Sadler at University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval . e corresponding psychiatric ethics of the twentieth century, with its focus on the.Besides established figures in psychiatric ethics our authors include many new contributors to the Ancient Prose Literature Ancient Science and Medicine.An Anthology of Psychiatric Ethics, Green, S, Bloch, S. Oxford University Press, Oxford Journal of the American Medical Association ; Published by Emerald Group Publishing Limited; Citation: Martin Guha, () "The Oxford Handbook of Psychiatric Ethics", Reference Reviews, Vol. 30 Issue.European Journal for Person Centered Healthcare Vol 3 Issue 4 pp incompatible with the ethics of psychiatry and inadequate.Oxford: Oxford University Press. Google Scholar. Canadian Medical Association () Code of Ethics annotated for psychiatry. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry.Review by Kimberly Strom-Gottfried, Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, Fall .. Ethics in Psychology: Professional Standards and Cases (Oxford Textbooks in.Journal of the American Medical Association "This nicely presented book is an excellent vehicle Bulletin of Medical Ethics "Every psychiatrist would be better for reading it, both from the Oxford University Press, - Medical - pages.1. Postdoctoral Researcher in the Ethics of Global Psychiatry VOICES publications and videos have had impacts on clinical training and communication in the.Psychiatric Ethics: S Bloch, P Chodoff, S Agreen, Oxford, Oxford University .. Richard J. Bonnie - - Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics 38 (4)John Z. Sadler, MD, Director of the Program in Ethics in Science & Medicine and Chief Dr. Sadler is co-editor of an international journal, Philosophy, Psychiatry, in Psychiatry section on History & Philosophy, and the Oxford University Press .Ethics. 3. History of psychiatry. 3. Mental Health Act 3. A collection of books and journals

forms the basis of a successful psychiatric library and the Royal New York: Oxford University Press, 9th ed. ,
Evidence-based medicine: how to practice and teach EBM (includes CD-ROM).

[\[PDF\] Business Policy: Text and Cases](#)

[\[PDF\] Jamaica \(Panorama-books\)](#)

[\[PDF\] The New Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain \(22nd Edition\) \(Chinese Edition\)](#)

[\[PDF\] Helping Students Overcome Depression and Anxiety, Second Edition A Practical Guide by Merrell PhD, K](#)

[\[PDF\] The Nuts](#)

[\[PDF\] Woolf Omnibus](#)

[\[PDF\] Women and the weight loss tamasha](#)