

Suppose that you are a healthcare provider working at the acute medical ward during a respiratory pandemic. In the end, resolving this ethical conundrum necessitates balancing the conflicting ideals, guaranteeing objectivity and equality in the allocation of resources, and respecting patient wishes (autonomy). The speaker opposes favoring one individual over another, as seen in the dilemma of providing a respirator to Miss Lamis but not to Mr. Smith, which they perceive as discriminatory and contrary to the principle of nonmaleficence. Deontology emphasizes following moral rules and duties regardless of the outcomes. The choice of whether to provide Miss Lamis a ventilator from Mr. Sami in a complicated medical situation requires balancing the concepts of beneficence and justice. You are mainly responsible for supervising and offering care for cases of moderate to severe infections, including decisions on the need for using ventilators, which are in severe shortage due to the surge in patients' admissions. This principle is crucial in end-of-life care decisions, including those involving life-sustaining treatment, nutrition, hydration, and symptom control, with the aim of relieving suffering. Nonmaleficence, a core principle in medical ethics, dictates that physicians must not harm patients and entails avoiding actions that cause pain, suffering, incapacitation, offense, or deprivation of life's goods. Among the patients that are currently on ventilators is Mr. Sami, a 78-year-old male, who had multiple cardiovascular and respiratory diseases for years before admission. Miss Lamis has presented with moderate to severe respiratory infection, and she would clearly benefit from using a ventilator without which her condition is expected to deteriorate. On the other hand, deontology would raise ethical concerns about removing the ventilator from Mr. Sami as it involves directly causing harm to one individual to benefit another which goes against the principle of not causing harm to others. In order to strike a balance between these ideals, healthcare decisions must take into account medical prognosis, patient autonomy, and the objective of maximizing total benefit while maintaining justice. Practically, this means physicians must carefully balance the benefits and burdens of interventions, opting for those that are least burdensome and most beneficial for the patient. Discuss the ethical implication of potential action that can be done in this case, that is, keeping or removing the ventilator by writing a brief paper as illustrated by the expected output below. Here are the two main theories explored: Deontology: This theory focuses on duties and obligations. Based on medical opinions from senior consultants working at the same hospital, Mr. Sami is highly unlikely to recover, even with the continuous use of a ventilator. These frameworks guide decision-making in tricky situations by emphasizing different aspects of the dilemma. This introduction dives into the world of ethical theories. Miss Lamis utilitarianism would support reallocating the ventilator to Miss Lamis as it aims to maximize overall benefit by saving the life of the patient with a higher chance of recovery. Utilitarianism focuses on the consequences of actions and seeks to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number of people. In order to justify redistributing the ventilator in order to save a life, beneficence is. A colleague suggests that you remove the ventilator from Mr. Sami, and use it to save the life of Miss Lamis. Someone following this approach would make consistent choices based on their established principles. It has two branches: act utilitarianism (focusing on the consequences of a single action) and rule utilitarianism (focusing on consequences of following general rules). Example: A terminally ill patient asks if they'll be okay after surgery. Justice, however, brings up issues with equitable resource distribution and the moral ramifications of giving one life in

order to rescue another. However, no additional ventilators are available for use. Deontology might say treating all five aligns with your duty to help as many as possible. Utilitarianism: This theory emphasizes the consequences of actions.