

Index

- A Local Authority v MA NA and SA* 97
abortions *see* terminations of pregnancy
Abraham's Law 110
actual risk, information about 231–2
administrative liability 252
advance directives 44–5, 62, 199, 207, 222
advice provision 9–10
age of capacity to consent 269–70
 Germany 221
 Nordic countries 169–71, 178–9
 Russia 242
 legal gaps and conflicts in regulation 252–3
 South Africa 213–14
Aintree University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (Respondent) v James (Appellant) 88–9
Airedale NHS Trust v Bland 93
alcohol abuse/dependence 249
 in pregnancy 180–1
Almaraz, R. 113–14
alternative treatments 117–18, 119, 227–8
assault 209–10
assisted reproduction 179, 245
Australia 6–31
 Brus v Australian Capital Territory 18
 capacity to consent 20–2, 24–7
 Chappel v Hart 15–18, 29
 disciplinary regulation of health practitioners 27–9
 F v R 7–8
 mental health legislation 23–7
 Morocz v Marshman 18–19
 Rogers v Whitaker 8–11, 29, 31
 decision revisited in *Rosenberg v Percival* 11–15
 statutory reform 19–20
autonomy 72, 262, 269–70
 Australia 15, 19, 25–6
 Canada 40
 China and Macao compared with the West 161–2
 Nordic countries 164–5
 South Africa 183–4, 187, 189–90
 UK 74, 75, 76–7, 81, 83–4, 85, 93, 96–7, 98–9
battery 6, 79, 209–10
Belgium 124–43, 258, 266, 267, 270
 challenges, controversies and remedies 143
 exceptions 136–8
 compulsory treatment in the general interest 136
 emergencies 137
 incompetent persons 138
 therapeutic exception 138
 waivers 137
liability 138–43
 burden of proof 138–40
 causal connection 140–1
 loss of chance to refuse treatment 141–2
patient's health status information 125–6
principle and characteristics of
 informed consent 126–35
 comprehensibility of information 129–30
 content of the information 132–5
 forms of information and consent 127–9
 information provider 131–2
 recipient of information and consent-giver 130–1
specific rules for specific interventions 135–6
beliefs 86–7, 94–6
beneficence 203

- Berman v Hutchinson Cancer Center* 117
- best interests 269
- South Africa 203, 205–6
 - standard in the Nordic countries 172
 - UK 88–9, 90–1
- biomedicine 255
- bodily integrity and security 183–5, 187
- Bolam* principle 7, 8, 9, 11, 19, 79–80
- Brazier, M. 75
- Broude v McIntosh* 184
- Brus v Australian Capital Territory* 18
- bullets, extraction of 184–5
- burden of proof 265, 267–8
- Belgium and France 138–40
 - Germany 232–3
- caesarean sections 94–5, 151
- Canada 32–73, 188, 258, 264
- bijural system 34–5
 - doctor–patient relationship 35–7, 50, 63–4
 - duty to disclose 49–57
 - diagnosis and prognosis 52
 - informed refusal 55–7
 - patient’s particular
 - circumstances 54–5
 - proposed treatment 53–4
 - emerging challenges and considerations 66–71
 - genetic data and the duty to inform 69–71
 - mobile health technologies 66–9, 71–2
- exceptions 61–3
- emergency doctrine 62
 - therapeutic privilege 61
 - waivers 63
- healthcare provision 33–4
- liability 63–6
- causation 65–6
 - establishment and breach of duty 63–4
 - injury 64–5
- medical records and privacy 37–40
- principle and characteristics of informed consent 40–9
- capacity 43–6
 - elements and format of consent 40–2
 - informed consent 47–9
 - specific consent 46–7
 - voluntariness 43
 - specific rules for specific interventions 57–60
 - elective and cosmetic procedures 58–9
 - medical research 59–60
- Canada Health Infoway 39
- Canadian Medical Protective Association (CMPA) 68
- cancer research 117–18
- Canterbury v Spence* 105, 106–7, 194–5
- capacity to consent 262
- Australia 20–2
 - mental health legislation 24–7
 - Canada 43–6
 - Germany 220, 221
 - patients lacking capacity *see* vulnerable patients
 - South Africa 198
 - UK 77, 82–3, 99
- case law, role of 257–9
- Castell v De Greef* 184, 187, 191, 192, 207, 210
- causal connection/causation 268
- Belgium and France 140–3
 - Canada 65–6
 - US 108–9
- Chappel v Hart* 15–17, 29
- characteristics of informed consent *see* principles and characteristics of informed consent
- Chatterton v Gerson* 78, 79
- Cherrix, A. 110
- Chester v Afshar* 188, 192
- children *see* minors
- China 144–62, 259, 261, 262, 263
- challenges, controversies and remedies 158–62
 - content of information 154–5
 - exceptions 156–7
 - information provider 153
 - liability 157–8
 - patient’s health status information 146
 - principle and characteristics of informed consent 146–8
 - recipient of information and consent-giver 149–53

- regulations affecting informed choice 144–5
- specific rules for specific interventions 155
- choice 2
 - embracing while protecting the vulnerable 269–70
 - UK 74–5, 77
- civil liability 139–40, 250–1
- clinical testing 244
- clinical trials 229
- Collins v Wilcock* 76
- communication
 - ability to communicate and capacity 85
 - challenge of 263–5
 - problems in Macao 147–8
 - see also* interpretation/interpreters; language barriers
- complications 18–19, 176–7
- comprehensibility of information 129–30
- compulsion disorders 88
- compulsory treatment 97–8, 230
 - Australia 6
 - in the general interest in Belgium and France 136
 - Nordic countries 174, 179–81
 - Russia 245–9
- Confucianism 144, 149, 158–9, 261
- conscious informed consent 238
- consent
 - functions of 75
 - meanings of in healthcare 193–5
- consent forms 3–4, 263, 264
 - Belgium and France 127–8, 140
 - Canada 41
 - Macao 153
 - Russia 239, 240
- consent-giver
 - Belgium and France 130–1
 - China and Macao 149–53
 - Germany 221–3
 - Nordic countries 168–74
 - South Africa 197–9
 - UK 83–93
- content of information 2
 - Belgium and France 132–5
 - China and Macao 154–5
 - Germany 225–8
 - Nordic countries 175–7
- Russia 240–1
- South Africa 200–1
- contract, consent as 193–4
- Convention of Human Rights and Biomedicine (Oviedo Convention) 256–7
- Corn v French* 104
- cosmetic procedures/surgery 30, 58–9, 135–6, 178, 228–9, 259
- costs of treatment 118–20, 220
- criminal liability 138–9, 252
- CRISPR gene editing 101–2
- Culbertson v Mernitz* 105–6
- culture
 - cultural differences 259–60, 261
 - issues in South Africa 211–13
- custodians 230, 242–3
- damage of unpreparedness 142–3, 268
- decision causation 108–9
- Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen 236
- defensive practice 29–30
- delegation of information provision 132, 223–4
- Denmark 163, 258, 260, 267, 269
 - compulsory treatment 174, 180
 - content of information 175–7
 - Disciplinary Board 176
 - information provider 174–5
 - no-fault compensation scheme 181
 - patient's health status information 165–6
 - principles and characteristics of informed consent 167–8
 - recipient of information and consent-giver 169, 171, 172
 - specific rules for specific interventions 178–9
 - 'Ulysses contract' 180–1
- Department of Health and Community Services v JWB & SMB ('Marion's case')* 21
- desire-fulfilment theory 205–6
- diagnosis
 - information in Belgium and France 125–6
 - and prognosis in Canada 52
 - and treatment in Australia 9–10
- digital medical records 37–40

- disciplinary liability 251
- disciplinary regulation of health
 - practitioners 27–9
- distrust of doctors 160–1
- DL v A Local Authority* 76
- doctor–patient relationship 14, 15
 - Canada 35–7, 50, 63–4
 - juridicisation of 4
- doctor-specific risks 113
- doctors
 - broad duties 195
 - burden of proof in Germany 232–3
 - China
 - distrust of 160–1
 - income sources 159–60
 - experience of 16–17, 18–19, 114
 - reasonable doctor standard 105–6, 191, 266
 - US
 - burden on 113
 - financial interests 119–20
 - safety risks posed by 113–14
- Doyal, L. 195
- drug addiction/abuse
 - in pregnant women 180–1
 - Russia 242, 249
- drug risk information 53–4, 226–7
- duty to disclose 3, 4
 - Canada 49–57
 - genetic data and 69–71
 - formula for 107–8
 - genesis of in the US 104–5
 - Germany 218
 - UK 79–82
 - see also* information content;
 - information provider;
 - patient’s health status
 - information; recipient of
 - information
- eating disorders 88
- economic conflicts 118–20
- economic information 220
- elderly patients 29
- elective procedures 58–9
- electroconvulsive treatment (ECT) 23, 25–6
- electronic consent 41–2, 239, 264
- electronic medical records 37–40
- emergencies 268
 - Belgium and France 137
 - Canada 62
 - China and Macao 156
 - Germany 229
 - Russia 254
 - South Africa 202–3, 204–5
- emotional suffering 156–7
 - see also* therapeutic privilege
- empowerment 3, 121
- ‘equality of arms’ principle 232
- Esterhuizen v Administrator Transvaal*
 - 186, 210
- European Convention on Human Rights
 - 87, 98, 124, 235, 238
- European Court of Human Rights
 - (ECHR) 97–8, 235–6, 238
- exceptions 2
 - Belgium and France 136–8
 - Canada 61–3
 - China and Macao 156–7
 - Germany 229–31
 - Nordic countries 179–81
 - South Africa 203–8
 - UK 93–8
- experience, doctors’ 16–17, 18–19, 114
- explicit consent 167, 168
- express consent 195
- F v R* 7–8
- familism 149–50, 158–9, 261
- family decision-making model 150–1
- family paternalism 161
- Faya v Almaraz* 113–14
- fiduciary relationship 35–6
- Finland 163, 168, 179, 270
 - minors 170–1
 - patient’s health status information
 - 166–7
 - vulnerable adults 171, 172–3
- fiscal federalism 33–4
- France 124–43, 266–7, 270
 - challenges, controversies and
 - remedies 143
 - exceptions 136–8
 - compulsory treatment in the
 - general interest 136
 - emergencies 137
 - incompetent persons 138
 - therapeutic exception 138
 - waivers 137

- liability 138–43
 - burden of proof 138–40
 - causal connection 140–3
 - damage of unpreparedness 142–3, 268
 - loss of chance to refuse treatment 141–2
- patient's health status information 125–6
- principle and characteristics of
 - informed consent 126–35
 - comprehensibility of information 129–30
 - content of information 132–5
 - forms of information and consent 127–9
 - information provider 131–2
 - recipient of information and consent-giver 130–1
- specific rules for specific interventions 135–6
- French, J. 104
- future-representatives 171, 172
- 'gene surgery' 101–2
- general interest 136
- genetic data 69–71
- genetic testing 179
- Germany 216–34, 258, 264–5, 266, 267, 269, 270
 - challenges, controversies and remedies 233–4
 - content of information 225–8
 - exceptions 229–31
 - form of information 224–5
 - information provider 223–4
 - liability 231–3
 - burden of proof 232–3
 - information about actual risk 231–2
 - validity of consent 231
 - patient information 218–20
 - form of 218
 - purpose of 218
 - types of 219–20
 - personal injury doctrine 216–17
 - principle and characteristics of informed consent 220
 - recipient of information and consent-giver 221–3
 - responsible patient model 217
 - specific rules for specific interventions 228–9
 - timing of information 224
- Gillick v West Norfolk and Wisbech Area Health Authority* 21, 22, 90, 92
- Gillon, R. 193, 194
- globalization 256–7
- Golde, D. 119
- Grimes v KKI* 193
- guardians 20–1, 131, 171, 172–3, 222–3, 242–3, 253
 - see also* proxy (surrogate) consent
- Hamilton, K. 117
- Hart, Mrs 16–17
- He, J. 101–2
- Health Canada 67
- Health Professions Council of South Africa (HPCSA) 189, 190, 195, 196, 198, 200, 202, 204
- health status
 - of doctors 113–14
 - of the patient *see* patient's health status information
- hereditary conditions 70
- HIV chemoprophylaxis 245
- HIV status 113–14
- hypothetical consent 233
- Iceland 163, 166, 167, 168, 177, 179
 - minors 169–70
 - vulnerable adults 171, 173
- implicit/implied consent 127, 167, 168, 196–7, 220
- incapacitated persons *see* vulnerable patients
- individual autonomy *see* autonomy
- individualism 261
- infectious diseases 247–8
- inferred consent 196–7
- information content *see* content of information
- information provider 2
 - Belgium and France 131–2
 - China and Macao 153
 - Germany 223–4
 - Nordic countries 174–5
 - Russia 244

- South Africa 199–200
- informed refusal 55–7
- inherent jurisdiction 97
- injury, proving 64–5
- injury causation 108
- intellectual disability 21
- interpretation/interpreters 166, 167, 213, 218, 260
- Ipp report 19

- Johnson v Kokemoor* 114
- judicial bypass 111
- Junhke v Turkey* 97–8
- juridicisation of doctor–patient relationship 4

- King, A. 91
- King's College Hospital NHS Trust v C* 85
- Klais, D. 118
- Kokemoor, R. 114
- Konovalova v Russian Federation* 238
- Kracke v Mental Health Review Board* 25
- Krause, J.H. 119
- Kruger v Coetzee* 208–9

- language barriers 54–5, 147–8, 212–13, 218, 254–5, 259–60
 - see also interpretation/interpreters
- legislation, role of 257–9
- liability
 - Belgium and France 138–43
 - Canada 63–6
 - China and Macao 157–8
 - Germany 231–3
 - Nordic countries 181
 - Russia 249–52
 - South Africa 208–10
- life-sustaining treatment, refusal of 56–7
- living wills (advance directives) 44–5, 62, 199, 207, 222
- Local Authority v A* 86
- Local Authority v E* 88
- loss of the chance to refuse treatment 141–2
- Louwrens v Oldwage* 191
- Lymburg v Jefferies* 186

- Macao 144–62, 260, 267–8
 - challenges, controversies and remedies 158–62
 - content of information 154–5
 - Criminal Code 145
 - exceptions 156–7
 - information provider 153
 - liability 157–8
 - patient's health status information 146
 - principle and characteristics of informed consent 146–8
 - recipient of information and consent-giver 149–53
 - specific rules for specific interventions 155
- malpractice 112, 219
- '*Marion's case*' 21
- Marshman, Dr 18–19
- material risks
 - Belgium and France 133–5
 - Canada 47–8, 51–2
 - development of law in Australia 6–19
 - South Africa 187
 - UK 81
- 'mature minor' doctrine 46
- McDonald v Wroe* 191–2
- McWhirter, R. 29
- Medical Board of Australia 28
- medical facilities, differences in 228
- medical intervention, defining 237
- medical paternalism 31, 161, 203, 259
- medical records
 - Canada 37–40
 - Russia 237
 - administrative liability 252
 - disciplinary liability 251
- medical research 59–60, 71–2, 117–18, 229, 244
- medical training
 - students' presence during labour 238
 - unauthorized pelvic exams 102, 114–15
- mental illness
 - mental health legislation in Australia 23–7
 - Russia 253–4
 - recipients of information 243–4
 - severe mental disorders 248–9

- UK 95–6
- mental incapacitation *see* vulnerable patients
- Mernitz, R. 105–6
- Midgely, J.R. 201–2
- Minister of Safety and Security v Gaqa* 184–5
- Minister of Safety and Security v Xaba* 184–5
- minors 269–70
 - age of capacity to consent *see* age of capacity to consent
 - Australia 21–2
 - Belgium and France 130
 - Canada 45–6
 - Germany 221–2
 - Nordic countries 169–71, 174
 - Russia 242–3
 - procedure when treatment has been refused 246–7
 - South Africa 201–2
 - UK 82–3, 89–93
 - US 110–11
- mobile health technologies 66–9, 71–2
- moderate familism 159
- modified-objective test 63–4, 65–6
- Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board* 31, 78, 80–1, 258
- Moore v Regents of the University of California* 119–20
- Morocz v Marshman* 18–19

- natural will 230
- necessity, doctrine of 203, 204–5
- negligence
 - and the burden of proof 267–8
 - liability *see* liability
 - review of negligence claims in Australia 30–1
- negotiorum gestio* (unauthorized treatment) 204–5
- new therapies 227–8
- NHS Trust v Dr A* 86–7
- NHS Trust v FG* 96
- no-fault compensation schemes 181
- non-recommended treatments 28
- non-verbal consent 82
- Norberg v Wynnrib* 35

- Nordic countries 163–82
 - challenges, controversies and remedies 181–2
 - content of information 175–7
 - exceptions 179–81
 - information provider 174–5
 - liability 181
 - patient's health status information 165–7
 - principles and characteristics of informed consent 167–8
 - recipient of information and consent-giver 168–74
 - compulsory treatment for patients without capacity 174
 - minors 169–71
 - vulnerable adults 171–4
 - specific rules for specific interventions 178–9
 - see also under individual countries*
- Norway 163, 168, 175, 177, 179, 181, 269
 - compulsory treatment 174, 180
 - minors 169, 170
 - patient's health status information 166–7
 - vulnerable adults 171, 172, 173–4

- O'Brien v Cunard* 196
- oral consent 82, 127, 148, 167, 168, 263
- oral information provision 224–5, 263
- organ donation/transplantation 178, 242
- out-of-network fees 120
- Oviedo Convention 256–7

- Pane v MEC Free State* 208, 210
- paternalism
 - family 161
 - medical 31, 161, 203, 259
- patient
 - assumed characteristics of 262
 - best interests *see* best interests
 - burden of proof in Germany 232–3
 - particular circumstances 54–5
 - protection of and preserving choice 269–70
 - responsible patient model 217

- patient-centred standard (reasonable patient standard) 88–9, 105, 106–7, 108–9, 265–6, 268
- patient–family codetermination 150
- patient-focused approach 258
- patient’s autonomous decision-making model 150–1
- patient’s health status information
 - Belgium and France 125–6
 - China and Macao 146
 - Nordic countries 165–7
 - Russia 241
 - South Africa 185–93
 - UK 78–9
- paying for healthcare 159
- PBU and NJE v Mental Health Tribunal* 26–7
- Pearce v United Bristol Healthcare NHS Trust* 80
- peer professional opinion 19
- pelvic examinations, unauthorized 102, 114–15
- Percival, P. 11
- permission, consent as 194–5
- personal injury doctrine 216–17
- personality rights 124, 130
- personalized medicine 181–2
- physical integrity 216–17
- pregnant women
 - drug- or alcohol-abusing 180–1
 - UK 94–6
- presumed consent/will 152–3, 222–3, 229–30, 269
- principles and characteristics of informed consent
 - Belgium and France 126–35
 - Canada 40–9
 - China and Macao 146–8
 - Germany 220
 - Nordic countries 167–8
 - Russia 237–9
 - South Africa 193–7
 - UK 75–7
- privacy 37–40
- private healthcare services 211–12
- probable risk 48, 51
- professional standard (reasonable physician standard) 105–6, 191, 266
- prognosis 52
- proposed treatment 53–4
- protection of the vulnerable 269–70
- proxy (surrogate) consent 269
 - Belgium and France 130–1
 - Canada 45
 - China 149–51
 - Germany 230
 - Nordic countries 165, 171, 172–3
 - Russia 242–3
 - South Africa 198–9, 212
 - US 109–10
- prudent patient standard 80, 188, 191
- public health 156
- public policy 203, 204
- quality differences 228
- Quebec 34–5, 62, 63, 64, 69
 - duty to disclose 51–2, 60
 - genetic data 70–1
 - minors 45–6
- R v Brown* 77
- R v Collins & Ashworth HA, ex parte Brady* 94
- R v St George’s Health Care Trust, ex p MS* 96
- rare risks 133–5, 226, 266
- rates of complication 18–19
- rational-subjective test 66
- RC v Nottinghamshire NHS Trust* 96
- Re Alex* 21–2
- Re B* 91
- Re B (adult: refusal of medical treatment)* 96–7
- Re C (adult: refusal of treatment)* 86, 87
- Re CA (Natural Delivery or Caesarean Section)* 95–6
- Re E (wardship)* 92
- Re King* 91
- Re MB* 95
- Re S (Adult: Refusal of Medical Treatment)* 94–5
- Re T* 76
- Re T (Adult: Refusal of Medical Treatment)* 94
- Re W (a minor) (medical treatment)* 93
- real and foreseeable risks 12
- reasonable patient standard 88–9, 105, 106–7, 108–9, 265–6, 268

- reasonable physician standard 105–6, 191, 266
 - Rebrikov, D. 102
 - recipient of information 2
 - Belgium and France 130–1
 - China and Macao 149–53
 - Germany 221–3
 - Nordic countries 168–74
 - Russia 242–4
 - South Africa 197–9
 - UK 83–93
 - recommendations of mobile health applications 68–9
 - referral 132
 - refusal to eat 93–4
 - refusal of treatment
 - Belgium and France 126
 - loss of the chance to refuse treatment 141–2
 - informed refusal in Canada 55–7
 - for minors in Australia 22
 - patients without decision-making capacity in Nordic countries 174
 - Russia 245–7
 - UK 87–8
 - Reibl v Hughes* 8, 51, 65–6, 188
 - relational autonomy 72, 265
 - relational dependence 265
 - relevant risks 133–5
 - religious beliefs 94, 96
 - repeated medical interventions 238–9
 - research 59–60, 71–2, 117–18, 229, 244
 - responsible patient model 217
 - Richter v Estate Hamman* 186, 191
 - right not to know 166–7, 241, 262
 - risk information 258
 - Belgium and France 133–5
 - China and Macao 154, 155
 - Germany 219–20, 225–8
 - liability in case of negligence 231–2
 - Nordic countries 176–7
 - risk frequency 133–5, 226, 266
 - Russia 240–1
 - South Africa 186, 187–9
 - standard of disclosure 266–7
 - see also material risks; serious risks
 - Rogers v Whitaker* 8–11, 29, 31
 - decision revisited in *Rosenberg v Percival* 11–15
 - Rompel v Botha* 186
 - Rosenberg v Percival* 11–15
 - Rossi, P.M. 113–14
 - RT v LT* 87
 - Russia 235–55, 258, 263
 - characteristics of informed consent 237–9
 - content of information 240–1
 - information provider 244
 - information recipient 242–4
 - age of capacity to consent 242
 - minors 242–3
 - persons with mental illness 243–4
 - legal gaps and conflicts in regulation 252–5
 - age of consent 252–3
 - emergencies 254
 - mentally incompetent patients 253–4
 - legal nature and effect of voluntary informed consent 235–7
 - liability 249–52
 - administrative 252
 - civil 250–1
 - criminal 252
 - disciplinary 251
 - refusal of intervention and medical care without consent 245–9
 - alcohol dependence, drug addiction or substance abuse 249
 - infectious diseases 247–8
 - minors and incapacitated persons 246–7
 - severe mental disorders 248–9
 - specific rules for specific interventions 244–5
- SA Medical and Dental Council v McLoughlin* 207
 - safety information 219
 - Salgo v Leland Stanford Junior University Board of Trustees* 104–5
 - Schoendorff v Society of New York Hospital* 256
 - Schweitzer v Central Hospital* 196

- Secretary of State for the Home Department v Robb* 93–4
- self-determination 2, 3, 27, 261
- Germany 219–20, 222, 225, 227
 - Nordic countries 164–5
 - principle in the UK 93–4
- self-interest 206
- serious risks 186, 266–7
- Belgium and France 133–4
 - Canada 48, 51–2
- severe mental disorders 248–9
- shared decision making 31, 116–17, 217, 264–5
- Sibisi NO v Maitin* 189–90, 191, 208, 210
- Sidaway v Bethlem Royal Hospital Governors* 9, 79–80, 188
- side effects 176–7
- simple medical interventions 238–9
- South Africa 183–214, 258, 259, 260, 267
- challenges, controversies and remedies 211–14
 - Constitution 183–4, 187, 204
 - content of information 200–1
 - exceptions 203–8
 - doctrine of necessity 203, 204–5
 - patient's best interests 203, 205–6
 - public policy 203, 204
 - therapeutic privilege 187, 203, 206–7
 - waivers 203, 207–8
 - information provider 199–200
 - liability 208–10
 - patient's health status information 185–93
 - Patients' Rights Charter 183, 188–9
 - principle and characteristics of informed consent 193–7
 - recipient of information and consent-giver 197–9
 - specific rules for specific interventions 201–3
 - emergencies 202–3
 - minors 201–2
 - terminations 201
- special examination 155
- special treatment 155
- specific consent 46–7, 196
- specific rules for specific interventions 267
- Belgium and France 135–6
 - Canada 57–60
 - China and Macao 155
 - Germany 228–9
 - Nordic countries 178–9
 - Russia 244–5
 - South Africa 201–3
- Spence, W. 106–7
- standards 265–7
- objective and subjective 268
 - prudent patient 80, 188, 191
 - reasonable patient 88–9, 105, 106–7, 108–9, 265–6
 - reasonable physician 105–6, 191, 266
 - in the US 105–8
- Starson v Swayze* 26
- Stephens v Myers* 210
- sterilizations 21, 111
- Stewart v Cleveland Clinic Foundation* 118
- Stoffberg v Elliot* 188, 197, 210
- subjective–objective test 13, 47
- substance abuse 249
- substituted judgement 172, 173
- surgery risk information 226
- surrogate consent *see* proxy (surrogate) consent
- Sweden 163, 166–7, 168, 175, 177, 179, 180, 181, 270
- minors 169, 170–1
 - vulnerable adults 171, 174
- Tameside and Glossop Acute Services Trust v CH* 95
- telemedicine 239
- telephone communication 225
- terminations of pregnancy 179
- Russia 244–5, 253
 - South Africa 201, 214
 - US 111, 121
- therapeutic information 219
- therapeutic privilege
- Belgium and France 138
 - Canada 61
 - China and Macao 156–7
 - Germany 230–1

- South Africa 187, 203, 206–7
- UK 80
- US 109
- timing of information 128–9, 224
- trusted person 130

- unauthorized pelvic exams 102, 114–15
- unauthorized treatment 204–5
- understanding 86, 129–30, 194, 262
- unemployment 211
- United Kingdom (UK) 74–100, 188, 258, 260, 269
 - capacity to consent 77, 82–3, 99
 - challenges in the future 98–100
 - exceptions 93–8
 - information disclosure 79–82, 99–100
 - minors 82–3, 89–93
 - patient's health status information 78–9
 - principle and characteristics of informed consent 75–7
 - recipient of information and consent-giver 83–93
 - vulnerable patients 77, 83–9, 97
- United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCPRD) 87–8
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) 257
- United States (US) 101–22, 262, 264, 265, 266
 - causation 108–9
 - consent for minors and vulnerable adults 110–11
 - critiques of informed consent 112–15
 - burden on physicians 113
 - malpractice 112
 - physician-specific risks 113
 - safety risks posed by the physician 113–14
 - unauthorized intimate examinations 102, 114–15
 - decision making beyond informed consent 116–20
 - economic conflicts and expense of medical care 118–20
 - existence of alternatives 117–18
 - exceptions 109–10
 - genesis of duty to get informed consent 104–5
 - standards for informed consent 105–8
 - reasonable patient standard 105, 106–7, 108–9
 - reasonable physician standard 105–6
- Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights 257
- unpreparedness, damage of 142–3, 268
- unreasonable fears/concerns 12–13

- vaccination of children 245
- validity of consent 2, 194–5, 217, 231
- Van der Walt, J.C. 201–2
- Van Oosten, F.F.W. 184, 210
- verbal consent 82, 127, 148, 167, 168, 263
- video consent 113, 264
- voluntary assumption of risk 194
- vulnerable patients 2
 - Australia 23–7
 - Belgium and France 130–1, 138
 - Germany 222–3
 - minors *see* minors
 - Nordic countries 171–4
 - Russia 243–4, 253–4
 - procedure when treatment has been refused 246–7
 - South Africa 198–9
 - UK 77, 83–9, 97
 - US 110–11
- waiting period 129
- waivers
 - Belgium and France 137
 - Canada 63
 - South Africa 203, 207–8
- Watters v White* 70
- Webster v Burton* 81
- wellbeing 206
- Welz, D. 207
- Whitaker, M. 8–9, 11
- withdrawal of consent 126, 168, 177
- World Association of Medical Law (WAML) 1–2

- Wran, N. 16
- written consent 82, 239, 263
- Belgium and France 127–8
 - China and Macao 148
 - Nordic countries 167–8
 - South Africa 195, 197
 - see also* consent forms
- written information provision 225
- Wye Valley NHS Trust v B* 94
- X v Finland* 98
- X v Sydney Children's Hospital Network*
22