ETHICS MAN Daniel K Sokol

Clarifying best interests

What should doctors consider when determining what's best for their patients?

If from the lamp emerged a bioethics genie who granted me only one wish, I would ask for the ability to determine what is in the best interests of a particular individual. With such insight I would resolve many of the thorniest dilemmas in clinical ethics, discerning immediately what is best for the patient. Should we withhold treatment from this severely disabled neonate? Should we repeatedly inform this woman with Alzheimer's disease that her husband died 10 years ago? Should we respect the confidentiality of this sexually active 14 year old girl?

Nowadays it is almost trite to say that "best interests" is a broader term than "medical best interests." While important, health is one value among others that may, on occasion, be offset by those others. Hence a bon vivant might accept the life shortening effects of eating full fat brie daily in exchange for the pleasure he derives from it. Overall best interests may legitimately differ from medical best interests, and the two should not be confused.

The philosopher Ronald Dworkin makes another useful distinction: between experiential interests and critical interests. Experiential interests concern our sensations of pain and pleasure. I have experiential interests in playing squash, performing magic, and writing my BMJ column. Under this conception, it makes no sense to talk of the experiential interests of patients in a persistent vegetative state. They have no such interests. They do, however, have critical interests. These concern the sort of things that give meaning to our lives, that ultimately determine whether our lives are going well or badly. Friendship, the wellbeing of loved ones, and the respect of others are examples of critical interests. These can be frustrated or satisfied even in the absence of consciousness. Spreading malicious rumours behind someone's back can harm their critical interests even if that person never finds out; so too can failing to discharge a

promise to hand over a dead person's savings to her children. Why? Because most people have critical interests in maintaining a good reputation and helping their family to flourish.

The existence of critical interests explains why clinicians should attempt to uncover patients' past and present wishes, either by consulting the patients themselves (or their relatives) or from written documents such as advanced statements. What things are important to this person? How can we respect his or her critical values in our clinical management? To paraphrase Raanan Gillon, professor of medical ethics at Imperial College London, and others, the trick is not to put ourselves in the patient's shoes, but to imagine what it is like for the patient to be in his or her shoes. This requires an appreciation of that person's experiential and critical interests.

When patients are unable to make their own decisions, doctors should, on legal and ethical grounds, act in their best interests. However, even when patients are autonomous most doctors strive to do their best for their patients. In his book Resolving Ethical Dilemmas Bernard Lo offers a strategy to promote a competent patient's best interests. Firstly, try to understand the patient's perspective. ("What worries you most about this illness/treatment/ operation?") Secondly, address any concerns and misunderstandings. This may be enough to resolve any initial disagreement about treatment. Thirdly, if appropriate, try to persuade the patient to accept medically indicated interventions. If persuasion is unsuccessful, negotiate a plan that is mutually acceptable to both parties. Try to find common ground, a compromise solution; give the patient more time or information to decide; and invite them to speak to a colleague or other patients with similar experiences. If this strategy fails, accept the patient's refusal. This approach aims to protect patients from



The trick is not to put ourselves in the patient's shoes, but to imagine what it is like for the patient to be in his or her shoes

99

seemingly unwise decisions, while respecting their autonomy.

As we have privileged access to our own interests, respecting a person's autonomy tends to benefit them. One of the greatest tragedies in medicine is when respecting a patient's autonomy has the opposite effect: when it goes against their critical interests. Although formally having capacity, we can sometimes be blind to our own good; thus the seropositive 25 year old declines our outstretched hand at the edge of life's precipice, her judgment clouded by indifferent relatives and the short lived experiential interests of illicit drugs. Her refusal to be treated signals a premature death. Such is the price of our liberal emphasis on respecting autonomy, whatever its undeniable benefits. Although it is legally obligatory in Britain and the United States, respecting a competent refusal of treatment is not always in the patient's best interests.

When there is no indication of a patient's values, how should we determine what is best? Clearly we should consider experiential interests. Yet critical interests also play a part, as all human beings share a common core of critical interests, such as the freedom from pain and indignity. The anencephalic baby with no prospects of a meaningful life has neither experiential nor critical interests in continued life. Where lies that indeterminate threshold below which attempting to prolong survival is no longer in a person's interests? This is where the genie's gift would be most helpful. Respecting a competent refusal of treatment is not always in the patient's best interests

Thanks to Ronald Sokol, Raanan Gillon, John Spicer, and James Wilson for reviewing early drafts of this article. Daniel K Sokol is a lecturer in medical ethics and law, St George's, University of London daniel.sokol@talk21.com Cite this as: *BMJ* 2008;337:a994

WHAT'S NEW ON BMJ.COM

bmj.com is updated continuously with the latest news, research, comment, and education and also features a rolling table of contents that shows every article published in the past seven days.

HOT TOPIC Population growth and climate change



John Gillebaud, emeritus professor of family planning and reproductive health, and Pip Hayes, general practitioner, in their editorial "Population growth and climate change," say that universal access to family planning should be the priority and that "doctors should help to bring family size into the arena of environmental ethics, analogous to avoiding patio heaters and high carbon cars." Let us know where you stand on this issue by submitting a rapid response (and voting in this week's poll on bmj.com).

GMC issues guidance for expert witnesses Three articles on bmi.com

The General Medical Council has given doctors guidance on their duties when acting as expert witnesses. Graeme Catto, the council's president, explains the background to the document; Clare Dyer ponders whether the new guidelines will help allay paediatricians' fears about acting as expert witnesses; and Jonathan Gornall has uncovered a trail of incompetence and maladministration after the collapse of a GMC case involving neonatal research that took 15 years to come to a hearing.

LATEST RESEARCH

Does integration of nutritional supplementation with other public health programmes in early life reduce the risk of cardiovascular disease in undernourished populations? Read this long term follow-up of the Hyderabad nutrition trial.

What's the protective efficacy of measles vaccination in infants in a low income country before 9 months of age? Read this interim analysis of a randomised controlled trial.

CLINICAL REVIEW

Hypothyroidism is one of the commonest chronic disorders in Western populations. Its annual incidence in the United Kingdom is 3.5 per 1000 in women and 0.6 per 1000 in men. Endocrinologists Bijay Vaidya and Simon H S Pearce review current approaches in the management of hypothyroidism in adults.

LATEST BLOGS

Anna Donald has finally moved house, but is facing unexpected difficulties:

"It took me an hour to get dressed. I put on my socks. Then realised I had no idea where a shirt, trousers, or indeed any useful item of clothing might be. ... I finally managed to assemble a hodge-podge of tops and bottoms, which I camouflaged with a large coat. I was late for an appointment with the pathetic and true excuse that I couldn't find my shoes, which my strange attire at least made credible."

Also new:

- Helen Barratt on paperwork
- Deborah Cohen on "I want great care"
 Trevor Jackson on unbiased doctors
- Harvey Marcovitch on expert witnesses
 Elizabeth Loder on sex at 70

• Richard Smith on Margaret Thatcher

Have your say on this and other BMJ blogs at blogs.bmj.com/bmj

Last week's poll

"Has the UK's four hour emergency care target compromised patient safety?"

You replied: YES 172 (72%) NO 67 (28%)

Andrew Hobart commented

"The four hour target was both the best thing to happen to emergency medicine and



the worst thing to happen to emergency medicine in the UK... I have worked in emergency departments in Australia where this target does not exist, and overall things are better in the UK (IMHO).

MOST COMMENTED ON

Should geriatric medicine remain a specialty? How the internet is changing health care Is sun exposure a major cause of melanoma? A discriminating judgment What's in a name?

MOST READ



Student rejected by Imperial because of conviction is granted interview at Manchester

Economic evaluation of human papillomavirus vaccination in the United Kingdom

Guillain-Barré syndrome

Relation of iron and red meat intake to blood pressure: cross sectional epidemiological study

Secular trends in self reported sexual activity and satisfaction in Swedish 70 year olds: cross sectional survey of four populations, 1971-2001 JAMES GLOSSOP.GUZELIAN