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Abstract
Summary: Hailed by its proponents as a doctrine that promises more equitable doctor-patient relationships, informed consent has also been decried as posing serious threats to the quality of care in this country. Ultimately, what is at stake in the controversy is nothing less than two equally entrenched but compelling strains in American legal and political history—the protection of individual autonomy versus societal regulation of individual freedom for the greater common good. In the case of psychiatric patients, the issue is further complicated because it is often precisely the patient’s very capacity for autonomous action that is in question. Central to the ethical doctrine of informed consent is that patients not only be apprised of and give their written consent to a particular treatment—as required by law—but that they understand what the treatment entails and consent to it.

Source
Romanian doctors who encounter controversial surrogate decisions such as refusal of life-saving interventions react differently from an ethical perspective. Some do not take into account the surrogates' rejection of treatment, while others respect and abide by the surrogates' decision and withhold the refused procedures, forgoing their ethical responsibilities.