

# Navigating Ethical Considerations in Palliative Sedation: A Comprehensive Discussion on the Principle of Double Effect and Compassionate End-of-Life Interventions

Carolina James\*

School of Nursing, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada

## Introduction

Palliative sedation, a widely acknowledged medical practice employed towards the end of life, is utilized for patients grappling with refractory symptoms that prove resistant to alternative medical interventions. This approach entails the administration of sedative medications to alleviate severe distress, especially in cases where other interventions have proven ineffective. However, concerns have been raised about the potential acceleration of death by suppressing a patient's respiratory drive during palliative sedation [1-3]. Traditionally, palliative sedation has been ethically justified through the application of the principle of double effect. Despite recent evidence suggesting that properly titrated palliative sedation is safe and effective without hastening death, the principle of double effect continues to be invoked to justify the practice, even when there is a minimal risk of expediting a patient's death. One less common clinical scenario where the Principle of Double Effect may still ethically justify palliative sedation is when it is pursued concurrently with the active withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment, particularly in cases involving compassionate extubation [4]. Palliative sedation, also known as terminal sedation, is employed when patients experience unbearable suffering, particularly in the final stages of a terminal illness. Its primary objective is to provide relief from refractory symptoms, such as severe pain, dyspnea, or agitation, through the carefully titrated administration of sedative medications, aiming to achieve a desired level of comfort while respecting the patient's dignity [5]. The Principle of Double Effect serves as an ethical doctrine guiding healthcare professionals in justifying certain medical practices with both positive and negative consequences. In the context of palliative sedation, this principle provides ethical guidance by stipulating that an action may be morally permissible if it meets specific criteria: the action is morally good or neutral, the good effect is intended while the bad effect is foreseen but not intended, and all other options to achieve the good effect have been exhausted. In unconventional cases, such as palliative sedation combined with compassionate extubation, the healthcare team faces ethical dilemmas. Compassionate extubation involves withdrawing life-sustaining mechanical ventilation when further treatment is considered futile or chosen to be discontinued by the patient or their surrogate decision-maker. Palliative sedation is then employed to ensure the patient's comfort during the extubation process, addressing distressing symptoms like air hunger [6,7]. The application of the Principle of Double Effect becomes particularly relevant in these scenarios, guiding healthcare providers in decisions related to discontinuing life-sustaining treatment while simultaneously initiating palliative sedation. The intention is to provide compassionate care by withdrawing futile interventions while prioritizing the patient's comfort and dignity, without intending to hasten their death [8-10]. In conclusion, palliative sedation remains a crucial component of compassionate end-of-life care for patients with refractory symptoms. Despite evidence supporting its safety and effectiveness, the ethical framework provided by the Principle of Double Effect continues to guide its use. Especially in unconventional cases where palliative

sedation coincides with compassionate interventions like extubation, this ethical principle helps healthcare providers navigate complex moral decisions, placing the patient's well-being and comfort at the forefront as they approach the end of life.

## Discussion

The use of palliative sedation, also known as terminal sedation, emerges as a crucial aspect of end-of-life care, particularly for patients facing refractory symptoms in the terminal stages of a life-limiting illness. The primary objective is to alleviate severe suffering, often associated with symptoms like pain, dyspnea, or agitation. Palliative sedation, achieved through the careful administration of sedative medications, aims to strike a delicate balance, providing relief while maintaining the patient's comfort and dignity. The ethical framework guiding the practice of palliative sedation is the Principle of Double Effect, a doctrine that has been invoked to justify medical interventions with both positive and negative consequences. In this context, the principle offers ethical guidance by delineating specific criteria: the action is morally good or neutral, the intended effect is positive, and any foreseen negative effects are not intended but may be tolerated if all other options to achieve the positive effect have been exhausted. This ethical foundation provides a framework for healthcare professionals as they navigate the complexities of providing comfort at the end of life. A noteworthy scenario in the discussion is the intersection of palliative sedation and compassionate extubation. Compassionate extubation involves withdrawing life-sustaining mechanical ventilation, a decision often made when further treatment is futile or chosen to be discontinued by the patient or their surrogate decision-maker. The incorporation of palliative sedation in such cases ensures that the patient experiences minimal distress during the extubation process, addressing symptoms like air hunger. In the presented case study, the application of the Principle of double effect proved to be pertinent. The ethical dilemma of discontinuing life-sustaining treatment while simultaneously initiating palliative sedation was navigated with the intention of providing compassionate care. The healthcare team aimed to withdraw futile interventions, prioritizing the patient's comfort and dignity without intending to hasten their death.

\*Corresponding author: Carolina James, School of Nursing, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada, E-mail: caroljame.97@yahoo.com

Received: 27-Dec-2023, Manuscript No. jpcm-23-124965; Editor assigned: 29-Dec-2023, PreQC No. jpcm-23-124965(PQ); Reviewed: 12-Jan-2024, QC No. jpcm-23-124965; Revised: 18-Jan-2024, Manuscript No. jpcm-23-124965(R); Published: 25-Jan-2024, DOI: 10.4172/2165-7386.1000608

Citation: James C (2024) Navigating Ethical Considerations in Palliative Sedation: A Comprehensive Discussion on the Principle of Double Effect and Compassionate End-of-Life Interventions. J Palliat Care Med 14: 608.

Copyright: © 2024 James C. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, palliative sedation remains an indispensable tool in the armamentarium of end-of-life care, offering relief for patients with refractory symptoms. Despite ongoing concerns and ethical considerations, recent evidence supports the safety and effectiveness of properly titrated palliative sedation. The continued reliance on the ethical framework provided by the Principle of double effect guides healthcare professionals in justifying this practice, ensuring that the positive goal of relieving suffering takes precedence over any foreseen negative consequences. Especially in unconventional scenarios where palliative sedation coincides with compassionate interventions like extubation, the ethical principles outlined in the discussion guide healthcare providers through complex decision-making processes. By prioritizing the patient's well-being and comfort, the integration of palliative sedation with compassionate end-of-life interventions aligns with the overarching goal of providing compassionate and patient-centered care during the challenging transition towards the end of life.

## References

1. Hackett J, Ziegler L, Godfrey M, Foy R, Bennett MI (2018) Primary palliative care team perspectives on coordinating and managing people with advanced cancer in the community: A qualitative study. *BMC Fam Pract* 19: 177.
2. Nordly M, Vadstrup ES, Sjogren P, Kurita GP (2016) Home-based specialized palliative care in patients with advanced cancer: a systematic review. *Palliat Support Care* 14: 713-724.
3. Plas AG, Pasman HRW, Schweitzer B, Onwuteaka-Philipsen B (2018) Improving palliative care provision in primary care: A pre-and post-survey evaluation among PaTz groups. *Br J Gen Pract* 68: 351-359.
4. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston MLT, Page M, et al. (2022) *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 6.3. John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, New Jersey, USA.
5. Silva M, Barros T, Baixinho C, Costa A, Sa E, et al. (2023) The Effectiveness of Home Care Coordinated by Primary Health Care to Improve the Care Management of People in Palliative Cancer Care: A Systematic Review Protocol.
6. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, et al. (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 372: n160.
7. Stone MJ (2001) Goals of care at the end of life. *Proc Bayl Univ Med Cent* 14: 134-137.
8. Haj-Ali W, Moineddin R, Hutchison B, Wodchis WP, Glazier RH (2020) Role of Interprofessional primary care teams in preventing avoidable hospitalizations and hospital readmissions in Ontario, Canada: A retrospective cohort study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 20: 782.
9. Duggleby WD, Degner L, Williams A, Wright K, Cooper D, et al. (2007) Living with hope: initial evaluation of a psychosocial hope intervention for older palliative home care patients. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 33: 247-257.
10. Walsh K, Jones L, Tookman A, Mason C, McLoughlin J, et al. (2007) Reducing emotional distress in people caring for patients receiving specialist palliative care. *Br J Psychiatry* 190: 142-147.