

The Role of Informed Consent in Healthcare Decisions

Posted on September 15, 2018

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/the-role-of-informed-consent-in-healthcare-decisions/>

Introduction

Informed consent is the process through which a patient receives understandable information about a proposed healthcare intervention and voluntarily authorizes or refuses it. The ethical foundation is respect for autonomy, but the process also supports trust, shared decision-making, and safer care. Current American Medical Association guidance emphasizes that patients must be able to receive information, ask questions, understand treatment alternatives, and make well-considered decisions; the consent process arises through communication rather than through a signature alone (American Medical Association [AMA], 2026a). A signed document may record the discussion, but it cannot establish valid consent when the patient did not understand the relevant information, lacked decision-making capacity, or was pressured into agreement. Conversely, routine low-risk care may involve verbal or implied consent without a lengthy form. The central elements are disclosure, understanding, voluntariness, capacity, and authorization. These requirements recognize that clinicians contribute medical expertise while patients contribute personal values, beliefs, goals, risk tolerance, family responsibilities, and preferences about quality of life. Informed consent is therefore a decision process, not merely administrative documentation.

Disclosure, Understanding, and Voluntariness

Effective disclosure includes the patient's condition, the nature and purpose of the proposed intervention, expected benefits, material risks, reasonable alternatives, and likely consequences of refusing treatment. The amount of detail should fit the decision: a routine blood draw does not require the same discussion as major surgery, chemotherapy, sterilization, or experimental treatment. Good disclosure also avoids overwhelming patients with technical language or an undifferentiated list of remote complications. Clinicians should explain which risks are common, which are serious, where uncertainty remains, and how recovery, pain, cost, or caregiving needs may affect daily life. Understanding must then be assessed rather than assumed. Teach-back is useful because asking patients to explain the plan in their own words can expose misunderstandings that a simple "Do you understand?" question misses. Qualified interpreters, visual aids, accessible communication devices, and additional time may be necessary. Voluntariness requires freedom from coercion or improper pressure. A clinician may recommend strongly, but the patient must remain able to ask questions,

disagree, or refuse without being threatened with abandonment from appropriate care.

Decision-Making Capacity and Refusal

Decision-making capacity is a clinical judgment about whether a patient can make a particular decision at a particular time. It differs from legal competence, which is determined by a court. Capacity is also not all-or-nothing. A person may be capable of deciding about a simple low-risk intervention while struggling with a complex decision involving major consequences. A widely used framework considers whether the patient can communicate a choice, understand relevant information, appreciate how the information applies personally, and reason about available options (Appelbaum, 2007). Capacity can fluctuate because of delirium, medication, intoxication, pain, fatigue, infection, neurological illness, or psychiatric symptoms. A capable adult generally retains the right to refuse recommended treatment even when clinicians believe the decision is medically unwise or could result in serious harm. Respecting refusal does not require agreement. Clinicians should confirm capacity, correct misinformation, explore the patient's reasoning, explain consequences, and document the discussion. Disagreement with the medical team is not itself evidence that a patient lacks capacity, even when the stakes are high.

Fluctuating Capacity and Supported Decision-Making

A patient whose decisions fluctuate during the day requires assessment rather than an automatic conclusion that a diagnosis eliminates capacity. Many people with neurological or psychiatric conditions retain full decision-making ability. Concern becomes greater when changing preferences occur together with poor attention, disorientation, memory impairment, or inability to appreciate consequences. Reversible contributors such as infection, delirium, medication effects, severe fatigue, pain, depression, or metabolic disturbance should be investigated. If a decision can safely wait, discussion should occur during the patient's clearest period, with information simplified or repeated as necessary. A changing mind does not by itself prove incapacity because people may reconsider after receiving new information or experiencing fear. The clinically important question is whether the patient can understand, appreciate, reason, and communicate sufficiently for the specific decision. Current AMA guidance also emphasizes involving patients with impaired capacity in decisions to the greatest extent possible rather than treating partial impairment as complete exclusion (AMA, 2026b). Supported decision-making should therefore be attempted before authority is transferred whenever circumstances permit.

Surrogates, Emergencies, and Best Interests

When an adult lacks decision-making capacity, an appropriate surrogate may make decisions under state law and institutional policy. Preference is generally given to someone the patient previously designated through a healthcare power of attorney or comparable mechanism; when no designee exists, state law may identify a hierarchy. The surrogate should represent the patient rather than simply substitute personal values. Substituted judgment asks what the patient would choose based on prior statements, beliefs, goals, and known preferences. If those wishes are unknown, a best-interest standard considers expected benefit, suffering, burdens, prognosis, and reasonable alternatives (AMA, 2026b). Emergency treatment may proceed without prior informed consent when a decision must be made urgently, the patient cannot participate, and no surrogate or applicable directive is available. That exception is narrow and ends when participation or surrogate decision-making becomes possible (AMA, 2026a). Even when a surrogate is legally authorized, the patient should remain involved as much as possible because a person who lacks full capacity may still communicate preferences, comfort, fear, or dissent.

Research, Technology, and Communication Barriers

Clinical consent should be distinguished from research consent. Research seeks generalizable knowledge and is governed by additional human-subject protections because participation may offer no direct benefit and can introduce risks beyond ordinary care. Communication barriers can undermine consent in both settings. Language differences, health literacy, hearing or vision impairment, cognitive limitations, time pressure, inaccessible digital portals, and power relationships may prevent meaningful understanding even when documentation appears complete. Electronic signatures and telehealth can improve access, but they do not guarantee comprehension. A patient should not be expected to authorize a complex intervention through a small screen or inaccessible portal without meaningful opportunity for questions. Family members can provide emotional support, but qualified interpreters are generally preferable for sensitive or technically complex discussions because relatives may omit, soften, or alter information. Modern consent processes also increasingly need to explain how health data may be accessed or used. The ethical test remains functional: communication is adequate only when it enables the patient or surrogate to make an informed and voluntary decision.

Conclusion

Informed consent protects the patient's role as an active decision-maker in healthcare. Its validity depends on communication that explains medically appropriate options, supports understanding, preserves voluntariness, evaluates decision-making capacity, and results in authorization or refusal.

Documentation is important, but a signed form cannot substitute for this process. Patients with capacity may refuse recommended treatment, and clinicians should not redefine disagreement as incapacity simply because the consequences are serious. When capacity fluctuates, teams should investigate reversible causes and support decision-making during the clearest period whenever safe. When capacity is absent, legally appropriate surrogates should use substituted judgment or, when preferences are unknown, the patient's best interests while continuing to involve the patient as much as possible. Emergency exceptions are limited to urgent circumstances in which ordinary consent cannot be obtained. Current AMA guidance continues to place communication, patient participation, and decision-specific capacity at the center of ethical care (AMA, 2026a, 2026b). Informed consent therefore protects dignity, trust, transparency, and the legitimacy of clinical decisions.

References

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

American Medical Association. (2026b). *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.