At a Morbidity and Mortality Review Committee meeting, committee members decided to bring the case of F. T. to the attention of the hospital’s administrators, risk manager, and ethics committee. It was a case in which mistakes made by hospital staff members had probably led to a patient’s continuing coma.

F. T., a 54-year-old woman, was admitted to the hospital after a cerebrovascular accident. She had a history of hypertension and uncontrolled diabetes. Following her initial recovery, she was transferred to the hospital’s rehabilitation service. At this point she was alert and oriented, but had significant sensory and motor deficits. Rehabilitation was begun, with the staff ordered to monitor her blood pressure and blood sugar daily.

The patient attended therapy and began making progress. But three days later, F. T. experienced a severe hypoglycemic reaction. The next morning she was found to be unresponsive. Efforts to arouse her were unsuccessful, and she was transferred to intensive care.

F. T.’s course remained unchanged during the rest of her hospitalization. She was eventually discharged to a nursing home because her family was unable to care for her at home.

A routine morbidity and mortality review revealed that the physician’s order for daily blood sugar monitoring had not been carried out by the rehabilitation staff. If the monitoring had been done as ordered, the severe hypoglycemic reaction would probably have been prevented.

The question was then raised: Should the family be notified of this omission and the fact that it probably contributed to the patient’s present condition?

Focusing the Ethical Question
The basic ethical question that needs to be addressed here is whether the hospital has a responsibility to tell the family in the case of a serious mistake, even if providing such information might increase the risk of a malpractice suit.

To focus this discussion, I want to avoid other questions often raised in similar situations. Sometimes we ask whether the mistake made was really a contributing factor in the patient’s deterioration. That is an important question, and the answer can have serious implications for treatment of the patient, but it is not the question here. For purposes of this discussion, I ask that we accept the opinion on the case description: The omission probably did contribute to the patient’s decline.

I would also like to avoid the question of whether informing the family of the mistake will increase the likelihood of a malpractice suit. That, too, is often an important question, but it is more an issue of prediction than of ethics. For purposes of focusing on the ethical question, I am assuming that informing the family may increase the likelihood of a suit.

So, should the family be told about the mistake? I think the answer is yes, except in unusual circumstances.

The Responsibility to Inform
Professionals and service organizations have a fundamental responsibility to provide competent service. When they fail to provide competent service and make serious mistakes that result in harm to the patient, responsible professionals and organizations will ordinarily:
- Correct the problem, if possible
- Take steps to prevent similar mistakes in the future
- Inform the patient or the patient’s representative that a serious mistake has been made

In the case of F. T., it is too late to correct the mistake. Taking necessary steps to ensure that
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The burden of proof is on those who advocate withholding information.

Unusual Circumstances
Ethical analysis is often a matter of clarifying general responsibilities—and then asking another question: Are there any reasons why the general guideline might not apply in this particular case? In many ethics cases, differing responsibilities need to be balanced, and a determination regarding priorities needs to be made. In regard to patient confidentiality, for example, respect for privacy generally requires that information not be acquired or shared without permission. In some situations, however, respect for patient confidentiality might put others at risk. A determination then needs to be made about how serious the risk is and whether it is sufficient to override confidentiality claims.

A similar situation exists here, I think. As indicated, the general ethical obligation is to provide information about treatment that the reasonable patient and family would expect to be given. This includes acknowledgment of serious mistakes. We do need to ask, however, whether any considerations in this situation might override this normal responsibility.

Hospitals employ risk managers, not just to protect the institution's self-interest, but to protect the institution's ability to serve the public good. If a strong case can be made that the public good would be seriously harmed by a malpractice suit, then protection of the public good might be considered an overriding responsibility that would justify withholding information. But that would, I think, be a very unusual circumstance. The burden of proof is on those who advocate withholding information.

The danger with deciding, for the public good, to withhold information is that the institution may identify its own interest with the public good too easily. At a minimum, ethical sensitivity would seem to require a review (perhaps by the ethics committee) before a decision is made to withhold information in a case like that of F. T.