



6th International Conference on Clinical Ethics Consultation

May 11-14, 2010 ♦ Portland Art Museum ♦ Portland, Oregon, USA

www.ethics2010.org



Abstract Submission Form – Papers

Please contact John Tuohey at ethics@providence.org with any questions.

Name: Nicolas Foureur (1,a), Eirini Rari (1,b), Emmanuel Jacquemin (2,c), Olivier Soubrane (3,d), Véronique Fournier (1,e).

Title/Degree: a:MD; b: MPsych; c:MD; d:MD, Ph.D.; e:MD, Ph.D.

Institution:

(1) Clinical ethics centre, Cochin Hospital, Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Paris

(2) Paediatrics department, Bicêtre Hospital, Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Paris

(3) Surgery department, Cochin Hospital, Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Paris

Country: FRANCE

Email: ethique.clinique@cch.aphp.fr

Phone including country code (<http://www.countrycallingcodes.com>): 0033 1 58 41 22 33

Proposed title of paper: “Empirical ethics: Long-term follow-up study of living liver donor candidates”

Abstract with 3 clearly stated objectives in 250 words:

Since 2003, as a clinical ethics centre, we collaborated in the living donor liver transplantation (LDLT) program of Bicêtre and Cochin hospitals in Paris, meeting all the candidates for donation during their pre-harvesting screening. Five years later, we felt necessary to implement a follow-up study in order to appreciate the long-term stakes for candidates of the global as well as ethics screening and to revisit through their eyes the ethical pertinence of the all process.

Methods: In-depth qualitative telephone interviews with the candidates for donation (harvested or not) minimum one year after the recipient’s transplantation. Interviewers were members of the clinical ethics team. The issues explored were: candidate’s and recipient’s somatic and psychological status, changes in familial and socio-economic/professional dynamics, candidate’s current views on his own experience as potential or real donor, on the whole LDLT process and living donation in general.

Results: 51 out of 69 included people participated (15 were lost for follow-up, 3 refused). Results will be presented and discussed according to our work-hypothesis that differences in candidates revisiting LDLT may be related to patient’s age (child versus adult), donor’s versus recipient’s sex, type of donation (living versus cadaveric) and patient’s current health-status.

Conclusion: Results are expected to shed new light on the ethical founding/grounds of LDLT and permit to improve current practices in terms of ethical soundness.

If you have or will publish on this topic, please cite reference:

Fournier V, Beetlestone E, Planguet F, Branchereau S, Jacquemin E, Scatton O, and Soubrane O.

“Consent by living donors: an ethics alibi?”. Bioethica Forum; 2008; Vol1; No2: 115-120.

Are you planning to or will you be willing to submit a poster along with your paper?

Yes No