

Child-rearing ability and the provision of fertility services: an Ethics Committee opinion

Ethics Committee of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine

The American Society for Reproductive Medicine, Birmingham, Alabama

Fertility programs may withhold services from prospective patients on the basis of well-grounded reasons that those patients will be unable to provide minimally adequate or safe care for offspring. This document was reviewed and updated; this version replaces the previous version of this document, last published July 2013 (Fertil Steril 2013;100:50-53). (Fertil Steril® 2017;108:944-7. ©2017 by American Society for Reproductive Medicine.)

Earn online CME credit related to this document at www.asrm.org/learn

Discuss: You can discuss this article with its authors and with other ASRM members at <https://www.fertstertdialog.com/users/16110-fertility-and-sterility/posts/20850-25101>

KEY POINTS

- Fertility programs may withhold services from prospective patients on the basis of well-grounded reasons that those patients will be unable to provide minimally adequate or safe care for offspring.
- Fertility programs may provide services to prospective patients who would benefit from medical treatment except when significant harm to a future child is likely.
- Fertility programs should develop written procedures for making a determination to withhold services when there are concerns about the child-rearing capacities of prospective patients.
- A program's assessment of a patient's inability to care for a child or potential to cause harm to a child should be made jointly among members of the program and, if indicated, consultation with appropriate other professionals (for example, with a mental-health professional), and should be documented.

- Persons with disabilities should not be denied fertility services on the basis of disability.

Providers of infertility services are sometimes faced with patients who do not appear to be well situated to provide safe or adequate care for children. Treating these patients may lead to the birth of a child who is reared by parents who are psychologically unstable, abuse drugs, may abuse the child or the other parent, or present other risks to the well-being of the child. Accurate predictions about parental child-rearing ability are not easily made, and personnel in fertility programs may not feel equipped to make them. This poses an ethical dilemma in which clinicians must weigh the potential interests of future offspring against the needs and desires of infertile patients. The aim of this opinion is to provide guidance to fertility programs in such circumstances to facilitate each program's individualized decision-making. It addresses whether clinicians must provide services to persons whom they suspect might not

be able to provide adequately for the child's welfare, or whether clinicians have an ethical obligation not to provide these services. This opinion also discusses the extent to which a clinician's own ethical views of minimally acceptable child-rearing and possible responsibility for the future child may be taken into account in appropriately deciding whether to accept a patient for infertility treatment.

THE NATURE OF THE DILEMMA

Fertility specialists provide services that treat or bypass medical and nonmedical problems that interfere with the ability to have children. Fertility specialists ordinarily focus on medical aspects of the situation. Except in third-party reproduction, psychological screening or consultation with patients generally does not occur. Attention focused on the home or rearing situation of children born as a result of treatment is not common.

As with persons who reproduce without assistance, no systematic screening of patients seeking fertility services to investigate their ability or competency in rearing children has traditionally occurred or been thought to be appropriate, as would ordinarily

Received October 3, 2017; accepted October 4, 2017.

Reprint requests: Ethics Committee, American Society for Reproductive Medicine, 1209 Montgomery Hwy, Birmingham, Alabama 35216 (E-mail: ASRM@asrm.org).

Fertility and Sterility® Vol. 108, No. 6, December 2017 0015-0282/\$36.00

Copyright ©2017 American Society for Reproductive Medicine, Published by Elsevier Inc.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2017.10.006>

occur in adoption. The desire to reproduce prompts a wide variety of individuals to seek infertility treatment, including subcategories of patients for whom questions of child-rearing ability might legitimately arise. For example, while infrequent, many programs have had treatment requests from persons who have a history or current evidence of uncontrolled or untreated psychiatric illness, substance abuse, violent or criminal behavior, child abuse, previous loss of parental rights, or ongoing partner abuse. These factors and others may lead a fertility program to question whether such patients are likely to cause significant harm to a future child.

Concerns about child-rearing abilities of patients present a dilemma for fertility programs. As providers of medical services, programs do not routinely evaluate the child-rearing ability of their patients or conduct home studies as adoption agencies do, nor has it been thought their role to do so. There is no existing child to be placed for adoption and thus no need for the home studies and the scrutiny that occur in adoption. Medical factors have been the key determinant of whether treatment will be provided; some physicians argue that this should be the only consideration in deciding whether to provide services (1).

Fertility programs, however, are not totally removed from social and psychological considerations in providing treatment. Programs may obtain social or psychological history information from patients, either via intake forms or through conversations that occur during the course of treatment. Programs may require patients to meet with a counselor. Such counseling has become routine for patients using donor gametes and embryos or gestational carriers. Even though fertility programs do not seek to assess parenting adequacy specifically, pretreatment medical evaluation of patients might reveal potential problems, such as uncontrolled psychiatric illness, a history of child or spousal abuse, or substance abuse. In such situations, some programs and providers may be reluctant to proceed with treatments, either out of concern about their role in helping patients become parents who may be potentially harmful to their child or because of fears of legal liability. At the same time, practitioners may feel that they are not competent to make such predictions and should not be required to do so. Providers also may feel that it is necessary to respect the right of persons to have children if they so choose and to avoid charges of unlawful or improper discrimination in withholding services from them.

The problem is complicated because many interests are involved. The interest of future children having a safe home environment and minimally competent rearing parents must be reconciled with the interest of infertile persons receiving the treatment services they need to reproduce versus the provider's own sense of moral responsibility in deciding which patients to treat.

RECONCILING THE INTERESTS

We analyze below the interests of offspring, infertile persons, and providers of fertility services.

It is difficult to reach optimal solutions for all situations, but the Committee believes that fertility programs should be attentive to the potential for serious child-rearing deficiencies in their patients. If they have a substantial, non-arbitrary basis for thinking that parents will provide inadequate or unsafe child-rearing, they should be free to refuse to provide treatment services to such patients. Because of the difficulty of making judgments reliably, however, clinicians should deny services only after investigation shows that there is a substantial basis for such judgments. In reaching such conclusions, it is imperative that programs not engage in prohibited or unjust discrimination. Given the great importance of procreation, infertile persons should not be denied services without a thorough review and determination jointly made by members of a multidisciplinary treatment team. However, fertility providers are not morally obligated to refuse services in all cases in which there might be a question about risk to the child. It is very difficult to make such complex judgments about potential future risk to offspring. Some will prefer to proceed with treatment, giving greater weight to the parents' desire to reproduce. Also, programs may adopt a written policy that they will provide fertility services to all persons who qualify medically except when significant harm to future children is likely.

The Welfare of Offspring

Entwined with the child-rearing ability of fertility patients are questions about the welfare of future offspring and the duty of prospective parents and those aiding them to avoid situations that may jeopardize child welfare. Helping parents achieve the birth of a child could be considered a morally worthwhile endeavor. The provision of reproductive treatments, unlike childbirth in unassisted reproduction, permits contemplation by third parties of the possibility of risks or harm to offspring born to a particular set of parents.

Many persons have argued that the well-being of offspring should be the primary consideration in determining whether medical services should be provided to treat infertility. Indeed, the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act, setting up a regulatory authority for assisted reproductive technology in the United Kingdom, made this consideration explicit. It stated that treatment services should not be provided unless account has been taken of the welfare of any child who may be born as a result of treatment (2).

The well-being of offspring is an overriding ethical concern that should be considered in determining whether to provide infertility services. Respecting the interests of children in the context of infertility, however, poses an ethical paradox. In most instances, decisions about whether to provide a treatment will determine whether a child will be born at all, not whether the child will be born into a safe environment. In such cases, the only way to protect the child from the risks of concern would be to avoid its birth altogether.

A large body of philosophical and bioethical literature discusses the issue of harm to offspring from the very conditions of their conception or birth (3–11). Some commentators have concluded that unavoidable "harm" to a child from

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8779884>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8779884>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)