The Role of Informed Consent in Healthcare Decisions

Posted on September 15, 2018

Informed consent is the process through which a patient receives understandable information about a proposed healthcare intervention and voluntarily decides whether to accept or refuse it. The original essay correctly identifies autonomy, disclosure, counseling, decision-making capacity, and documentation as central components. However, informed consent is not simply a form that a patient signs. A signature records part of the process, but valid consent depends on meaningful communication, comprehension, voluntariness, capacity, and authorization. A patient may sign a detailed document without understanding it, while another patient may provide valid verbal consent to a routine intervention after an appropriate discussion (American Medical Association, 2026; Beauchamp & Childress, 2019).

Informed consent is fundamental in ethics and law because competent adults generally have the right to decide what happens to their bodies. Clinicians possess specialized knowledge, but professional expertise does not give them unlimited authority to impose treatment. The patient brings personal values, religious beliefs, risk tolerance, family responsibilities, quality-of-life priorities, and goals. Shared decision-making joins these two forms of knowledge. The clinician explains medically reasonable options and recommendations, while the patient determines which option is consistent with the life that patient wishes to lead (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019; Vaughn, 2017).

The Elements of Informed Consent

Disclosure

The clinician should explain the patient's condition, the nature and purpose of the proposed intervention, expected benefits, material risks, reasonable alternatives, and the likely consequences of declining treatment. The amount of detail depends on the decision. A routine blood draw requires less discussion than a high-risk operation, chemotherapy, sterilization, or participation in experimental research. Information should focus on what a reasonable patient would consider important and on any particular concern the clinician knows matters to the individual (American Medical Association, 2026).

Disclosure should not become an overwhelming list designed mainly to protect the institution. Presenting every remote complication in technical language can make understanding more difficult. Good communication separates common risks, serious risks, uncertainties, and practical effects such as recovery time, pain, cost, or the need for assistance. The clinician should explain which option is

recommended and why while making clear that recommendation is not coercion.

Understanding

The patient must understand the essential information well enough to make the decision. Understanding does not require medical expertise or perfect recall. It requires a functional grasp of the diagnosis, proposed intervention, main benefits and risks, alternatives, and consequences of refusal. Clinicians should avoid assuming comprehension merely because the patient remains silent or says “yes” (Appelbaum, 2007).

The teach-back method can help. Instead of asking, “Do you understand?” the clinician may ask the patient to explain the plan in their own words. Misunderstandings can then be corrected. Qualified interpreters, visual aids, plain-language materials, communication devices, and additional time may be necessary. Family members can support discussion when the patient wishes, but they should not replace a professional interpreter in sensitive or complex situations.

Voluntariness

Consent must be given without coercion or improper pressure. Patients are naturally influenced by illness, family opinion, professional recommendations, finances, and fear. Influence does not automatically invalidate a decision. The ethical problem arises when threats, deception, manipulation, or overwhelming pressure prevent a genuine choice (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019).

Healthcare professionals hold authority, so the way options are presented matters. Saying that a patient is “noncompliant” before exploring concerns may silence questions. A clinician can recommend strongly when evidence supports one option, but should acknowledge uncertainty and the patient’s right to refuse. The patient should know that declining a proposed treatment will not result in abandonment from all appropriate care.

Decision-Making Capacity

Decision-making capacity is the patient’s clinical ability to make a particular decision at a particular time. It is different from legal competence, which is a determination made by a court. Capacity is not all-or-nothing. A person may be able to consent to a simple, low-risk intervention while lacking the ability to make a highly complex decision. Capacity can also fluctuate because of delirium, medication, pain, infection, intoxication, fatigue, mental illness, or neurological disease (Appelbaum, 2007).

A widely used framework evaluates four abilities: communicating a consistent choice, understanding relevant information, appreciating how the information applies personally, and reasoning about the options. The original essay lists understanding, awareness of risks, and communication, but

appreciation and reasoning should be added. A patient might repeat facts accurately yet deny that the diagnosis applies to them, indicating impaired appreciation (Appelbaum, 2007).

Authorization and Documentation

After the discussion, a capable and voluntary patient authorizes or refuses the intervention. Documentation should identify what was discussed, who participated, questions raised, the decision, and any special communication support. A signed form is especially common for surgery, anesthesia, blood products, research, and other significant interventions, but the form should reflect a conversation rather than replace it (American Medical Association, 2026).

Not every healthcare interaction requires an extensive written form. Consent can be implied for ordinary actions such as extending an arm for blood-pressure measurement after explanation. More invasive or risky procedures require explicit authorization. Emergency exceptions are narrow and should not be used to bypass a capable patient's refusal.

The Right to Refuse

Informed consent includes informed refusal. A capable adult may decline recommended treatment even when clinicians believe the decision is unwise or when refusal may result in serious harm or death. Respecting autonomy does not mean approving the choice. It means confirming capacity, ensuring understanding, exploring reasons, correcting misinformation, and documenting the decision (American Medical Association, 2026; Beauchamp & Childress, 2019).

Patients may refuse because of religious belief, prior experience, side effects, cost, caregiving obligations, distrust, or a different understanding of acceptable quality of life. Some concerns can be addressed through another option. Others remain after discussion. A clinician should not label a value-based refusal as incapacity simply because the patient chooses differently from the medical team.

The 64-Year-Old Patient With Multiple Sclerosis

The original case concerns a 64-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis whose position regarding an intervention changes during the day. In the morning she agrees, later refuses, and during another lucid period agrees again but cannot remember the earlier decision. The original essay concludes that multiple sclerosis has damaged her ability and that she therefore cannot provide valid consent. That conclusion may be correct in the specific case, but the diagnosis alone is not enough. Many people with multiple sclerosis retain full decision-making capacity. The clinician must assess the patient's actual cognition and the reason for the fluctuation (Appelbaum, 2007).

Possible causes include delirium, infection, medication effects, severe fatigue, pain, depression, cognitive impairment related to neurological disease, or difficulty communicating. Delirium is especially important because it can fluctuate across hours and may indicate an urgent medical problem. The team should assess orientation, attention, memory, understanding, appreciation, reasoning, and ability to express a choice. Reversible causes should be treated where possible.

Does Changing One's Mind Prove Incapacity?

A patient is allowed to change their mind. Inconsistency alone does not prove incapacity because a person may reconsider after receiving new information or experiencing fear. The concern in this case is the combination of repeated reversal, inability to remember the earlier decision, and possible alteration in mental status. The clinician should determine whether the choices reflect a stable value or cognitive fluctuation.

The assessment should occur at the patient's best level of functioning. If the intervention can safely wait, discussion may be scheduled when fatigue or medication effects are lower. Information should be simplified and repeated, and trusted support persons may help the patient express values. Capacity support is ethically preferable to immediately transferring authority (American Medical Association, 2026).

Decision-Specific Assessment

The degree of capacity required is related to the complexity and consequence of the decision, although the same core abilities are assessed. A low-risk treatment with a clear benefit may require less complex reasoning than refusal of life-saving treatment with major consequences. This does not mean raising the standard merely because the patient refuses. It means examining whether the patient understands the stakes of the particular choice (Appelbaum, 2007).

The clinician should document the questions asked and the patient's responses. Psychiatric, neurological, ethics, or legal consultation may help in difficult cases, but the treating clinician remains responsible for the immediate assessment unless institutional policy provides otherwise.

Surrogate Decision-Making

When an adult lacks decision-making capacity, an appropriate surrogate may decide. The first choice is generally a person the patient previously designated through a healthcare power of attorney or similar document. If no person was designated, state law and institutional policy may establish a hierarchy such as spouse or partner, adult children, parents, siblings, or another relative or close associate. The original essay correctly notes that surrogate rules vary, but "parent or guardian" should not be presented as the universal answer for an adult patient (American Medical Association,

2026).

Substituted Judgment

The surrogate's first responsibility is to represent the patient, not to choose what the surrogate personally prefers. Under substituted judgment, the decision should reflect the patient's known wishes, values, statements, religious beliefs, and previous choices. An advance directive can provide guidance, but informal conversations may also be relevant (American Medical Association, 2026; Beauchamp & Childress, 2019).

For the patient with multiple sclerosis, the surrogate should consider what she said while capable, how she has approached similar treatments, and what outcomes she considers acceptable. A recent capable refusal or consent may carry significant weight. The surrogate should not override a clear prior choice merely because it is emotionally difficult.

Best Interests

If the patient's preferences are unknown, the surrogate and clinicians use a best-interest standard. They consider expected benefit, pain and suffering, quality of life as the patient might reasonably experience it, alternatives, and the burdens of treatment. Best interest should not be confused with whatever is easiest for the family or institution (American Medical Association, 2026).

Involving the Patient

Loss of full capacity does not eliminate the patient's voice. The American Medical Association advises involving patients to the greatest extent possible. A person may express comfort, fear, preferences, and values even when unable to complete the full reasoning process. Seeking assent and respecting resistance can preserve dignity, though urgent treatment and safety may create difficult exceptions (American Medical Association, 2026).

Emergency Treatment

When immediate treatment is necessary to prevent death or serious harm, the patient lacks capacity, and no surrogate or applicable directive is available, clinicians may provide emergency treatment under presumed consent. The ethical assumption is that a reasonable person would want necessary stabilizing care. This exception is limited to the emergency and ends when the patient regains capacity or a surrogate becomes available (American Medical Association, 2026).

Presumed consent should not justify a nonurgent intervention merely because obtaining authorization is inconvenient. If a procedure can wait safely, the team should continue efforts to locate a surrogate,

clarify wishes, and restore capacity. Emergency authority is a protective exception, not a general substitute for consent.

Research Consent and Clinical Consent

The original essay refers to federal regulations concerning legally authorized representatives. It is important to distinguish research from ordinary clinical care. Federal human-subject regulations govern consent for research funded or regulated under particular systems. Clinical treatment is governed mainly by state law, professional ethics, and institutional policy. Both fields emphasize informed and voluntary authorization, but their rules and purposes differ.

Research seeks generalizable knowledge and may not provide direct benefit. Participants must understand procedures, risks, alternatives, confidentiality, and the voluntary nature of participation. A legally authorized representative may consent for an adult who lacks capacity only where applicable law and approved research procedures permit. Additional safeguards are necessary for vulnerable participants.

Barriers to Valid Consent

Language and Health Literacy

Medical terminology can prevent understanding even among educated patients. Consent materials should use plain language, and interpreters should be available. Asking a family member to interpret can create errors, conceal sensitive information, and place pressure on the patient.

Time Pressure

Consent obtained moments before surgery may be legally documented but ethically weak if the patient had no realistic opportunity to consider alternatives. Important discussions should begin early when possible. The patient should be able to ask questions and consult family or advisers if desired.

Power and Dependence

Patients may fear that refusing will anger the clinician or affect future care. People in institutions, prisons, military settings, or dependent relationships may face additional pressure. Clinicians should explain that participation is voluntary and that appropriate care will continue.

Digital and Remote Consent

Electronic signatures and telehealth can make consent more accessible, but technology does not guarantee understanding. Identity, privacy, document access, interpreter support, and opportunity for questions must be addressed. A patient should not be expected to accept complex terms through a small screen without discussion.

When Consent Is Invalid

Consent may be invalid when material information is withheld, the patient lacks capacity, the choice is coerced, the patient misunderstands the intervention, the person authorizing is not legally empowered, or the procedure differs materially from what was discussed. Performing a medical intervention without valid consent may lead to ethical discipline, civil liability, or in some circumstances claims involving battery. It is too broad to state that every consent failure is automatically a criminal offense; legal consequences depend on jurisdiction and facts (Vaughn, 2017).

Ethics Consultation and Conflict

Disagreement may arise among clinicians, surrogates, and family members. An ethics consultation can clarify values, law, prognosis, and decision standards. Courts are generally a last resort when urgent conflict cannot be resolved. The goal is not to defeat one side but to identify the patient's rights and wishes.

Conflict can also signal poor communication. Families may hear different prognoses from different specialists or may not understand why capacity changed. A coordinated meeting can reduce confusion. Interpreters, social workers, chaplains, and patient advocates may support the process.

Conclusion

Informed consent is a continuing communication process through which a capable patient receives information, understands the decision, acts voluntarily, and authorizes or refuses care. Documentation matters, but a form alone is insufficient. The patient's autonomy is central because medical decisions affect the patient's body, values, risks, and future (American Medical Association, 2026; Beauchamp & Childress, 2019).

Decision-making capacity is specific to the decision and time. Multiple sclerosis does not automatically remove capacity, but fluctuating agreement, memory loss, and altered mental status require careful assessment and treatment of reversible causes. The patient should be supported to decide during the clearest period whenever safely possible (Appelbaum, 2007).

When capacity is absent, a legally appropriate surrogate uses substituted judgment based on the patient's wishes or, when those wishes are unknown, the patient's best interests. Emergency treatment may proceed without prior authorization only when delay threatens serious harm and no decision-maker is available. Throughout the process, the patient should remain involved to the greatest extent possible. Valid informed consent therefore protects more than institutional liability; it preserves trust, dignity, and the patient's rightful role in healthcare decisions (American Medical Association, 2026).

References

American Medical Association. (2026). *Code of Medical Ethics Opinion 2.1.1: Informed consent*.

American Medical Association. (2026). *Code of Medical Ethics Opinion 2.1.2: Decisions for adult patients who lack capacity*.

Appelbaum, P. S. (2007). Assessment of patients' competence to consent to treatment. *New England Journal of Medicine, 357*(18), 1834–1840.

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of biomedical ethics* (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Vaughn, L. (2017). *Bioethics: Principles, issues, and cases*. Oxford University Press.