

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

Dr Patrick Hill Acting Director Patient Experience Team NCGST

## List of questions

### 1. The definition of public health

- Do you agree with the definition of public health introduced above (“[W]hat we, as a society, collectively do to assure the conditions for people to be healthy”<sup>[1]</sup>)? If not, please explain why. What alternative definition would you propose?

### 2. Factors that influence public health

- Do you agree that interactions between the following five factors are the main influences affecting public health: the environment, social and economic factors, lifestyle, genetic background, preventative and curative health services? If so, do you think some are more important than others? Are there other factors we should include? If so, what are they?

**You have not included psychological factors such as beliefs and risk perception or emotional aspects such as fear and anxiety. These are crucial determinants of behaviour.**

**I am also concerned that you do not appear to have any health psychology expertise on the Council. Can I make a strong recommendation that you contact Professor Nichola Rumsey Chair of the British Psychological Society’s Division of Health Psychology to ask for appropriate expertise in Psychology of Public Health to be made available to the Council ( Nichola.Rumsey@uwe.ac.uk)**

### 3. Prevention of infectious diseases through vaccination

- Some countries<sup>[2]</sup> have a compulsory rather than voluntary system of vaccination. On what basis can such policies be justified to achieve herd immunity? Should they be introduced in the UK?
- For childhood vaccinations, parents make decisions on behalf of their children. Are there cases where the vaccination of children against the wishes of their parents could be justified? If so, what are they?

### 4. Control of infectious disease

- Control measures for specific diseases depend on how infectious a disease is and how it is transmitted. For infections that are directly transmitted from person to person, what justification would be required to render interventions such as forced quarantine, which helped to control the outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in Asia, acceptable in countries such as the UK where such measures may be considered to infringe civil liberties? If you think such measures cannot be justified, what are the principal reasons?
- In general, the earlier that an outbreak of disease is detected, the easier it will be to control. What would be suitable criteria to determine in what circumstances, and to what extent, the state should provide more resources to develop methods of preventing outbreaks of serious epidemics in other countries?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

- Travel and trade are key factors in the spread of infectious diseases. Global travel and exchange of goods are increasing rapidly. Each day, two million people travel across borders, including around one million per week between developing and developed countries. Disease-causing organisms and vectors can therefore spread quickly around the world.<sup>[3]</sup> Are new measures needed to monitor and control the spread of infectious diseases? If so, what would be promising strategies?
- Under which circumstances, if any, would mandatory testing for highly infectious and life-threatening diseases such as tuberculosis or HIV/AIDS be justified?

### **5. Obesity**

- Food is closely linked with individual satisfaction and lifestyle. This means that any strategy that seeks to change people's behaviour is likely to be perceived as particularly intrusive. How should this sensitivity be considered in devising policies that seek to achieve a reduction in obesity?
- While there is clear evidence about the extent and scale of obesity, there is far less clarity about what measures should be adopted by the government and other stakeholders to prevent it. In view of this uncertainty, what would be suitable criteria for developing appropriate policy?
- What are the appropriate roles and obligations of parents, the food industry, schools, school-food providers and the government in tackling the problem of childhood obesity?
- Is it acceptable to make the provision of NHS services dependent on whether a person is obese or not (see example in Section 4.2 of Part B)? If so, what criteria should govern whether or not interventions are provided, and should similar criteria be developed for other lifestyle-related health problems that are significantly under the control of individuals?

### **6. Smoking**

- The effects of smoking on health have been known for a very long time. Comprehensive measures by governments to prevent harm to the population are relatively recent. In your view, what are the reasons for this delayed response? Are there any lessons that can be learned from other countries, or from strategies pursued in other areas of public health?
- What are the responsibilities of companies that make or sell products containing hazardous substances, such as nicotine, that can be addictive? Should they be prosecuted for damaging public health or required to contribute to costs for treatments?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

- Should smokers be entitled to higher than average resources from the public healthcare system, or should they be asked for increased contributions? Would similar charges be justified for other groups of people who deliberately or negligently increase their chances of requiring public health resources, such as people engaging in adventure sports?
- Smokers argue that they choose to smoke. What rights does the state have to impose sanctions to prevent them from smoking? Does the state have the right to prevent the sale of tobacco, which is known to be addictive and highly dangerous? How vigorously is it reasonable for the state to act to prevent children and teenagers from smoking?

#### **7. Alcohol**

- The effects of excessive consumption of alcohol on the health of individuals and society have been known for a very long time. It can be argued that in view of the significant harm to individuals and society, comprehensive measures by governments to prevent harm are lagging behind those for tobacco. In your view, what are the reasons for this?
- In view of the impact of excessive consumption of alcohol on individuals and society, what are the roles and responsibilities of agents other than the government to limit consumption? Are there different responsibilities for producers and, for example, retailers? If so, which?

#### **8. Supplementation of food and water**

- Fortification of some foodstuffs such as flour, margarine and breakfast cereals has been accepted for some time. Why has the fluoridation of water met with more resistance? What are the reasons behind international differences in the acceptance of fluoridation of water? What criteria are there that determine acceptance?
- Which democratic instruments (for example, decision by Parliament or local authority, consultations or referenda) should be required to justify the carrying out of measures such as fluoridation?
- Achieving population benefits of fluoridation means restricting choice of individuals. Children benefit the most from fluoridation. However, as with vaccinations, adults, rather than children, are making decisions about whether or not to receive the intervention. Under what circumstances is it acceptable to restrict the choice of individuals in order to protect the health of children?

#### **9. Ethical issues**

- In your view, is there one of the following principles that is generally more important than the others: autonomy, solidarity, fair reciprocity, harm principle, consent, trust (see Section 5 in Part B)? If so, which one and why? Are there any other important principles that need to be considered?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

- Can these principles be ordered in a hierarchy of importance? If so, how would such an order relate to the five case studies (infectious diseases, obesity, smoking, alcohol, and the supplementation of food and water)? Would the order have to be redefined for each new case study? Are there particular principles that are of special importance to some case studies?
- In cases such as vaccinations or fluoridation parents decide on behalf of their children. Which ideas or principles should guide parents in their decisions?

The case studies have been chosen because we think that they highlight a number of important ethical tensions and conflicts between different agents, ranging from individuals to families, to NGOs, companies, healthcare professionals and the state. Other case studies could have been chosen to illustrate the same types of tensions and conflicts. We would be interested to hear if you think that there are other types of ethically relevant issues concerning public health that we should address.

Some of the questions asked with reference to a specific case study also apply to other case studies, for example whether people who accept some kind of damage to their health as part of their lifestyle, such as smokers, should be entitled to fewer resources from the public healthcare system, or be asked for increased contributions. Respondents are welcome to comment on these specific questions in a general manner.

Patrick