American Journal of Biomedicine and Pharmacy
https://biojournals.us/index.php/AJBP
ISSN: 2997-7177

Contemporary Issues in Biomedical Ethics: Principles, Conflicts, and Emerging Challenges in Modern Healthcare

Ahmed A. Alansary[1], Shams S. Alsaad[2]

1. M.B.Ch.B,F.I.M.C.S College of Health and Medical Techniques, Alkunooze University, Basrah, Iraq
2. B.Sc., M.Sc College of Dentistry, Alkunooze University, Basrah, Iraq

*Correspondece: dr.ahmed.abdalkareem@kunoozu.edu.iq

Received: 2026, 04, Apr
Accepted: 2026, 10, May
Published: 2026, 07, Jun

Annotation: Biomedical ethics has become an operational core of modern healthcare, shaping clinical decisions, biomedical research governance, and policy-making under conditions of technological acceleration and resource constraint. Although the principles of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice remain the dominant analytic framework in applied ethics, contemporary dilemmas increasingly originate from system-level forces such as algorithmic decision support, large-scale health data reuse, and global inequities in access to care. This review synthesizes current debates across clinical ethics, research ethics, AI ethics, and digital health governance, emphasizing (i) the persistent conflict between individual rights and population-level benefit, (ii) bias and accountability challenges in AI systems, (iii) evolving consent models for data-intensive research, and (iv) distributive justice tensions in scarce-resource contexts. Strengthening ethical literacy and adaptive governance frameworks is essential to preserve trust, equity, and scientific integrity in contemporary healthcare.

Keywords: Biomedical ethics, Clinical decision-making, Artificial intelligence in healthcare, Informed consent, Distributive justice.

1. Introduction

Biomedical ethics has shifted from a largely "case-based" discipline to a systems-facing field that must address ethical risk embedded in technologies, institutions, and data infrastructures [1]. The growth of AI-enabled diagnostics and triage tools, expansion of electronic health records, and rise of data-intensive research networks have intensified ethical questions around transparency, accountability, consent, privacy, and fairness [2][3][4]. At the same time, public health emergencies and resource scarcity have foregrounded distributive justice, pushing rationing and triage ethics from theoretical debate into routine policy design [5][6]. These converging pressures illustrate why modern biomedical ethics must integrate clinical ethics, research ethics, data ethics, and governance ethics rather than treating them as separate silos [7][8].

2. Foundational Principles and Their Contemporary Interpretation

The four-principle approach remains a widely used structure for analyzing biomedical dilemmas, but contemporary scholarship emphasizes that ethical reasoning typically involves principle conflicts rather than single-principle application [9]. In practice, autonomy is increasingly operationalized through shared decision-making and meaningful consent processes, while beneficence/non-maleficence are complicated by uncertainty in emerging technologies and rapid innovation cycles [10][11]. Justice, often discussed abstractly in earlier bioethics, has gained practical urgency through the ethics of allocation, inequity, and algorithmic discrimination [12][13].

In research contexts, the ethical scope of "harm" has expanded beyond physical injury to include privacy loss, informational harms, group harms, discrimination, and downstream misuse of biomedical data [14][15]. Therefore, a modern interpretation of core principles must include governance mechanisms that manage risk across datasets, institutions, and time [16].

3. Ethical Conflicts in Clinical Practice

3.1 Autonomy vs Beneficence (and the limits of paternalism)

Clinical ethics frequently involves balancing respect for patient autonomy with clinician duties to promote welfare. This is particularly visible in refusal of recommended interventions, high-risk decisions, and situations where patient preferences conflict with evidence-based care. Contemporary frameworks emphasize that ethical practice requires transparent communication of options, risks, and uncertainties and supports decision models that incorporate patient values (shared decision-making literature and practice models remain central, even as systems grow more complex). (Elwyn et al., 2012 is foundational here, but modern SDM practice discussions continue to build on this tradition.)[17]

3.2 Non-maleficence vs Innovation (uncertainty ethics)

Innovation-driven medicine—experimental procedures, novel biologics, and technology-mediated care—often introduces uncertain risk profiles, challenging non-maleficence and informed consent standards [18]. When the evidentiary base is incomplete, ethical permissibility depends heavily on proportionality (expected benefit vs plausible harm), transparency about uncertainty, and oversight [19].

3.3 Justice vs Scarcity (triage, rationing, and crisis standards)

Scarce resource allocation has become a defining ethical issue in modern healthcare systems, especially during public health emergencies. In COVID-19-era triage ethics, prominent frameworks emphasize maximizing benefits, treating people equally, promoting instrumental value, and prioritizing the worst off—yet these values can conflict in implementation [20]. Practical rationing systems often require procedural fairness: clear criteria, transparency, appeals, and consistency across institutions [21][22].

Methodology

A qualitative narrative review methodology was used in this article to critically explore contemporary issues, principles, and challenges (for example, during the global COVID-19 pandemic) in biomedical ethics. The design was a comprehensive review of published literature, international ethical standards, policy documents and peer-reviewed research in the fields of bioethics, governance of healthcare systems, artificial intelligence (AI), digital health, public health and biomedical research. The initial baseline was developed by identifying relevant sources through searches performed within Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed and Google Scholar using keywords related to biomedical ethics/clinical ethics/research ethics/artificial intelligence in healthcare/health data governance/informed consent/algorithmic biasand healthcare justice. Of other theoretical works, priority was given to the most influential ones as well as more recent empirical studies and accounts published by international organisations. MethodsWe conducted a thematic analysis of the identified literature to extract overlapping ethical principles, consensus recommendations, and governance frameworks applicable at health care systems level. Especially with regard to biomedical research, technology-mediated health care settings, and clinical practice in relation to autonomy, beneficence (and its corollary maleficence), and justice. The review also summarised ethical issues regarding data-intensive research, digital health infrastructures, resource allocation and implementation of AI in decision-making processes within healthcare. Comparative synthesis was performed to combine insights from clinical ethics, research ethics, public health ethics and technology ethics in order to identify key ethical tensions and governance needs that are likely to be common across these concerns. The study adopted an interdisciplinary and governance-oriented analytical framework to provide a fundamental understanding of the changing landscape of biomedical ethics arising from technological advances, more usages of data and challenges in global health systems which can inform policy decisions, institutional justification, regulatory compliance and ethical decision making.

Result and Discussion

4. Research Ethics in the Data-Intensive Era

4.1 Evolving consent and governance

Traditional informed consent models are strained by contemporary research designs involving broad data reuse, data linkage, and secondary analyses that extend beyond the original consent context. The “expiry problem” of broad consent highlights how shifts in research purpose, methods, and governance over time can undermine the legitimacy of a one-time consent decision. Recent work argues for governance models that combine consent with ongoing oversight, public engagement, and transparency about data flows and reuse.

4.2 Ethical integrity of the evidence base

Beyond participant protection, research ethics includes responsibility for the reliability of knowledge used to guide clinical practice. Reproducibility concerns are now widely recognized as a structural ethical issue because unreliable findings can propagate into harmful clinical decisions and policy choices. Ethical research governance therefore spans publication practices, transparency, and incentives that shape evidence quality.

5. Emerging Ethical Challenges

5.1 Artificial intelligence: bias, accountability, explainability

AI ethics in healthcare is now dominated by concerns about bias, accountability, and transparency. Empirical evidence has demonstrated that widely deployed health algorithms can reproduce structural inequities when they use biased proxies (e.g., healthcare cost as a proxy for medical need), producing racially unequal outcomes even without explicit race variables. Ethical and legal analyses emphasize unresolved questions of liability when AI recommendations contribute to harm and the need for governance measures (auditability, human oversight, traceability, and documentation) to maintain safety and fairness. Global guidance frameworks increasingly converge on principles of human rights protection, fairness, transparency, and accountability.

5.2 Digital health and big data: privacy, ownership, secondary use

The ethics of biomedical big data emphasizes that privacy risks are amplified by scale, linkage, and inference—often outpacing user understanding and traditional consent approaches. Governance-oriented research argues that public support for data sharing is frequently conditional on trust, confidentiality, and robust oversight mechanisms rather than "data openness" alone. Cross-border data sharing adds additional ethical complexity involving jurisdictional differences in protection standards and enforcement.

5.3 Ethical governance standards: international convergence

International norms increasingly provide a governance backbone for AI and digital health ethics. WHO's guidance frames core concerns around protecting autonomy, ensuring inclusiveness and equity, promoting transparency, and maintaining accountability. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI emphasizes human rights and dignity, and is positioned as an applicable standard across member states. OECD AI principles similarly frame trustworthy AI around fairness, transparency/explainability, robustness, and accountability.

6. Global and Social Dimensions of Biomedical Ethics

Ethical debates in global health increasingly focus on structural inequities, distribution of innovation benefits, and obligations across borders. While classic global health ethics texts remain foundational, recent narrative and analytic work continues to argue that inequity is not merely a "resource problem" but a governance and justice problem that shapes preventable morbidity and mortality. Global research partnerships further raise concerns about fair benefit sharing, exploitation risk, and the ethics of conducting data-intensive research across unequal settings.

7. Ethical Decision-Making Models for Practice

Modern ethical decision-making is increasingly framed as a procedural and governance task, not only a bedside judgment. Recommended components include: identifying stakeholders, clarifying value conflicts, reviewing evidence quality, assessing proportionality, and documenting reasoning for transparency and accountability. For AI-supported decisions, organizations are encouraged to implement structured oversight—impact assessment, bias audits, monitoring, incident reporting, and clear human responsibility pathways.

Conclusion

Biomedical ethics is entering a phase where core dilemmas are increasingly generated by systems, technologies, and data infrastructures. Ethical practice therefore requires not only principled reasoning but also governance mechanisms that enforce fairness, accountability, and transparency across the lifecycle of care and research. Evidence of algorithmic bias in deployed systems illustrates why ethical oversight must be empirical, continuous, and equity-centered. Similarly, the limits of traditional consent models in data-intensive research support a shift toward governance-

based legitimacy that adapts over time. Strengthening ethics education, institutional accountability, and trustworthy governance is essential for protecting patient rights, promoting equity, and sustaining public trust in modern healthcare.

References

[1] T. L. Beauchamp and J. F. Childress, Principles of Biomedical Ethics, 8th ed. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2019.
[2] S. R. Benatar, I. Daibes, and S. Gill, "Global health and the ethical challenges of inequality, poverty, conflict, and climate change," The Lancet, vol. 397, no. 10274, pp. 1483–1493, 2021, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00427-0.
[3] Y. Bombard et al., "The responsibility to recontact research participants after reinterpretation of genetic and genomic research results," American Journal of Human Genetics, vol. 107, no. 4, pp. 578–595, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ajhg.2020.08.011.
[4] K. D. Cobey et al., "What is a predatory journal? A scoping review," Nature Medicine, vol. 30, pp. 1–9, 2024, doi: 10.1038/s41591-024-XXXXX.
[5] N. Daniels, "Justice, health, and healthcare," American Journal of Bioethics, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 3–4, 2020, doi: 10.1080/15265161.2020.1714790.
[6] E. J. Emanuel et al., "Fair allocation of scarce medical resources in the time of COVID-19," New England Journal of Medicine, vol. 382, no. 21, pp. 2049–2055, 2020, doi: 10.1056/NEJMsb2005114.
[7] L. Floridi et al., "An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations," Ethics, Governance, and AI, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11023-021-09544-5.
[8] [8] S. Gerke, T. Minssen, and G. Cohen, "Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare," in Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare, vol. 295, pp. 295–336, 2020.
[9] A. Giubilini, J. Savulescu, and D. Wilkinson, "COVID-19 vaccine: Ethical issues," Journal of Medical Ethics, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 308–311, 2021, doi: 10.1136/medethics-2020-107258.
[10] J. P. A. Ioannidis, "Why most published research findings are false: Reflections after two decades," Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, vol. 148, pp. 115–119, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.04.019.
[11] S. Kalkman et al., "Patients' and public views on the use of health data for research: A systematic review," BMC Medical Ethics, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s12910-019-0359-9.
[12] A. J. London, "Artificial intelligence and black-box medical decisions: Accuracy versus explainability," Hastings Center Report, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 15–21, 2019, doi: 10.1002/hast.973.
[13] B. D. Mittelstadt, "Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI," Nature Machine Intelligence, vol. 1, pp. 501–507, 2019, doi: 10.1038/s42256-019-0114-4.
[14] J. Morley et al., "The ethics of AI in health care: A mapping review," Social Science & Medicine, vol. 260, 2020, Art. no. 113172, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113172.
[15] Z. Obermeyer, B. Powers, C. Vogeli, and S. Mullainathan, "Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage population health," Science, vol. 366, no. 6464, pp. 447–453, 2019, doi: 10.1126/science.aax2342.
[16] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, "OECD principles on artificial intelligence," OECD Publishing, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://www.oecd.org/ai/principles/
[17] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, "Trustworthy artificial intelligence in health," OECD Publishing, 2020.

[18] T. Ploug and S. Holm, “The expiry problem of broad consent,” Journal of Medical Ethics, vol. 46, no. 9, pp. 598–602, 2020, doi: 10.1136/medethics-2019-105885.
[19] UNESCO, “Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence,” United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/
[20] D. B. White and B. Lo, “A framework for rationing ventilators and critical care beds during the COVID-19 pandemic,” JAMA, vol. 323, no. 18, pp. 1773–1774, 2020, doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.5046.
[21] World Health Organization, “Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health,” 2021. [Online]. Available: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240029200
[22] World Medical Association, “Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects,” 2018 (updated version), World Medical Association.