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**Case 1**

Q1 :

No, I don’t see any concerns and that’s for some reasons and they include

Firstly the contract with the parents was not broken, so legally the clinic didn’t break anything, also the Embryos will be used for a good cause that usually has no available embryos to do the study on, and logically speaking Embryos are usually so young they won't feel any harm.

Q2 :

 If I was a member of the ethics committee I would support the usage of embryos for the research, theses types of research usually can't get human tissue so this opportunity is really good and beneficial for science and the whole welfare of society, doing nothing with the embryos would be such a waste for a good chance to find a cure or get near a cure, some might argue that the embryos could be given to adoption but as seen in the case these embryos might have a low survival rate and they would end up dead anyway, also since that the parents are dead and they haven’t mentioned doing anything specified to do with the embryos (like putting them up for adoption) one can take a chance to give them up to research.

Q3:

 Why should we destroy the embryos to get stem cells?

Well from the aspect of consent since that the parents of the embryos have passed away and they didn’t appoint another figure to decide what happens to the embryos

(basically, they left the clinic to decide what to do with them) destroying the embryos would break anyone’s consent.

From the beneficence concept and the Utilitarian ethics view of point, using these embryos would help to reach a new stage in curing this disease which could help almost 10 million people ( number of yearly diagnoses of Parkinson’s disease), and we can add to this concept the consequentialism destroying these embryos to obtain the needed stem cells wouldn’t harm anyone and since that science is a trial and error based even if the research gave negative results it would still mean progress to get closer to cure this disease.

**II**

1 :

From a medical point, preforming on the mother the surgery would be at best since the surgery is the best option and failing to do it would mean that the mother would lose her sight, as from the ethical point some say using the nonmaleficence concept they would the medical team should perform this surgery to prevent the mother from being blind, others would use the same concept of nonmaleficence “ to not harm “ to not do the surgery because the anesthesia would harm the fetus, leaving us with a dilemma.

 Another concept that could be used is (Veracity: the duty to tell the truth) before treating the mother the medical staff should tell and inform the mother about every aspect and hazards of doing the treatment on her and the baby if the mother refused or agreed to the treatment the medical staff should honor her wishes and her autonomy.

 Some medical staff would look at this from the consequentialism, and they would prefer to do or not to do the surgery depending on their beliefs on what to do, where it was no to do the surgery and take the mothers vision but give the baby life, or do the surgery and keep the mother’s lifestyle adequate but denying a potential life from existing.

 If the mother chose to not do the surgery the medical staff should respect her wishes, and they also should help her to go to this stage of vision loss with ease, providing her with training centers, and teaching her support system on the proper way to help a blind person.

 If the mother chose to do the surgery the medical staff should also respect her wish according to the “tolerance” concept, they also should reassure her that doing the surgery is a brave choice and she shouldn’t feel bad, also keeping her vision would give a better chance for her other future children to grow up properly and healthy, since that being a blind mom and taking care of newborns would be so difficult

 My personal opinion is that the mother should have the surgery since that’s vision is a vital sense to perform a normal life and its hard to adapt to the vision loss “without responsibilities” imagine having to adapt to the blindness with a baby to take care of, this would mean that the mother would suffer for a long time until she gets used to the new lifestyle, adding more to that just because this baby might be in danger and might pass away that doesn’t mean that this baby would be the last to come, dealing with a lost baby is difficult but with time and the right support the family will get over it, some might argue that this can also be the case for her vision ( that she can get through it with proper training and support) however losing the vision would be a lifetime of a new lifestyle but losing a baby as difficult it is would be temporary.

**II**

2:

 According to the justice concept in the principles of ethics, all should be treated fairly denying someone the chance of treatment because they might not be adhesive to it is not fair, explaining and giving the patient his chance with the treatment might be a life-altering event to him although he admits to “often” not taking the medications due to the substance abuse that shouldn’t mean he doesn’t deserve the opportunity to take the medication.

 While someone might use the consequentialism and nonmaleficence concept, would disagree since not taking the medication on time would mean that the disease would eventually be resistant to the treatment then the patient shouldn’t take the medication from the start and that’s to protect them more than anything else and to prevent the cloning of the virus while in the resistant state to other healthy individuals

 One could also argue that following the tolerance concept, we should treat the patient without judging him about his substance abuse, the medical staff in the clinic should provide a safe space for the patient to talk about his struggle with this abuse since the patient is showing traits of obligation and being safe about his issue, this means that he could with the proper care to withdraw from the substance-abusing behavior.

 Others might argue with the utilitarian ethics that giving this patient the prescription would be a waste and also would be more costly for the health care system since he might not take the medication and his condition might get worse this means that other healthy worthy patients with the same medical condition might miss their chance to get the medication.

 Some might only give him the medication only after the patient has dealt with his addiction issue, just to be safe and to prevent the patient health status from deteriorating, and to protect others who may come in contact with this patient

 In my opinion, I would prescribe the medication to the patient, but I wouldn’t just give him the medication and just neglect him after, nurses job isn’t just in the hospital or clinic only it expands to everywhere that care can be given and since the show, a somewhat good behavior about his condition this could be a great chance for him to save himself from the drug abuse and to protect himself from a further disease that might happen to him, taking this medication reliably would be so beneficial for him, and using the veracity concept telling him everything about what would happen and educating him might be good because it might just give him the boost to do better for himself. And if you failed to maintain a reliable intake of the medication and the virus develops resistance that shouldn’t prevent us as nurses from taking care of him since the justice concept says that all deserve to be treated fairly.