

CORRESPONDENCE



Avoidance of futile treatment—confluence of human dignity and ecological ethics

Thomas Bein*

© 2023 The Author(s)

I thank Hunfeld and Skrobik for their critical contribution [1] to the article recently published in Intensive Care Medicine [2]. I agree with the authors that a precise prognostication of survival in critically ill patients—specifically, at the beginning of treatment—based on ‘prognostic scores’ is hardly possible, and it is determined by several subjective factors. The special ethical responsibility of medical profession prohibits—as the authors state—that decisions on therapy reduction or withdrawal could be based on ‘scores’ or simple prognostic models. Estimation of death calculated by numerals derived from failing organs or other clinical determinations may be unethical. On the other hand, medical action is based on the four principles of *autonomy, non-maleficence, beneficence, and justice* [3]. Furthermore, the Geneva declaration of the World Medical Association stated: I will respect the autonomy and dignity of my patient.

Hence, the medical indication and the patient’s will build—as twin pillars—the ethical guidelines for physicians. A medical indication can be defined as the reasonable professional judgement that a therapy offer is suitable and useful to reach a specific therapeutic goal with a certain probability [4]. Both these columns are helpful to avoid futile treatment in critically ill patients, where futility is defined as a treatment strategy to prolong the lives of terminally ill patients even when there is no hope for successful treatment of their underlying pathology [5]. In a prospective study on 6916 assessments by 36 critical specialists of 1136 patients, it was found that 11% of patients were perceived as receiving futile treatment [6]. Futility results in overtreatment, as

diagnostic and therapeutic measures do not improve the length or quality of life of the patients.

Since worldwide healthcare systems—and, specifically, intensive care medicine as a high-tech, high-cost paradigm for modern medicine—contribute substantially to anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, and the current climate crisis becomes more and more threatening, the avoidance of futile treatment entails not only a challenge for medical ethics, but, in addition, important ecological aspects. I agree with Hunfeld and colleague that the assessment of medical futility is a complex, ambiguous, subjective, situation-specific, value-laden, and goal-dependent concept [6], which needs a careful, respectful, and responsible approximation on the basis of a multiple eyes principle.

In summary, careful and responsible awareness for the validity of medical indications and the patient’s will is substantial. The climate crisis is a concrete threat for humans, and yet, avoidance of harm—be it by promoting planetary health, or by avoidance of overtreatment or futility—will be more in the focus of physicians worldwide.

Funding

Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Declarations

Conflicts of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Open Access

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article’s Creative Commons licence

*Correspondence: thomas.bein@ukr.de
93053 Regensburg, Germany

This comment refers to the article available online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-022-06930-8>.

and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Accepted: 19 July 2023

Published: 7 August 2023

References

1. Hunfeld N, Skrobik Y (2023) Sense and sensibility. *Intensive Care Med.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-023-07134-4>
2. Bein T, McGain F (2023) Climate responsibilities in intensive care medicine—let's go green! An introduction to a new series in *Intensive Care Medicine*. *Intensive Care Med* 49:62–64
3. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF (2009) *Principles of biomedical ethics*, 6th edn. Oxford University Press, New York
4. Neitzke G (2014) Indication: scientific and ethical basis of medical practice. *Med Klin Intensivmed Notfmed* 109:8–12
5. Aghabarary M, Dehghan Nayeri N (2016) Medical futility and its challenges: a review study. *J Med Ethics Hist Med* 9:11
6. Huynh TN, Kleeup EC, Wiley JF, Savitsky TD, Guse D, Garber BJ, Wenger NS (2013) The frequency and cost of treatment perceived to be futile in critical care. *JAMA Intern Med* 173:1887–1894