

# The ethics of pregnancy testing

Emma Sharkey  
Siân Griffiths

## Abstract

Anaesthesia, surgery and ionizing radiation may all prove harmful to an undetected pregnancy. Elective procedures should be deferred at least until the second trimester to reduce the risk of teratogenicity or spontaneous abortion. If surgery cannot be delayed, anaesthetic or surgical techniques can be modified, and the use of intraoperative ionizing radiation avoided where possible. Determination of pregnancy status is mandated by current national guidelines prior to any procedure that may compromise the mother or fetus. In the vast majority of cases where the patient has the capacity to consent, there are no ethical or clinical dilemmas. However, girls under the age of 16 years have differing levels of capacity, resulting in various ethical concerns. Guidelines produced by the Royal College of Paediatric and Child Health provide a template to ensure departments maintain national standards, protecting patients from harm while assuring patient confidentiality and autonomy are respected.

**Keywords** Capacity; children; consent; ethics; pregnancy testing

**Royal College of Anaesthetists CPD Matrix:** 1F01, 1F02, 1F04, 1F05

## Background

Anaesthesia, surgery and ionizing radiation may all prove harmful to an undetected pregnancy.<sup>1</sup> An integral part of the preoperative assessment is to ensure pregnancy has been considered in all women of childbearing age. In 2003, the National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE) advised that women should be asked sensitively about the possibility of pregnancy and offered a pregnancy test with their consent if there is uncertainty.<sup>2</sup>

The National Reporting and Learning System received 42 reports between 2003 and 2009 when pregnancy status was not ascertained before a planned procedure. In three of these cases, the patient went on to have a spontaneous abortion. A further 12 cases were managed by the NHS Litigation Authority for legal proceedings. In response to this, the National Patient Safety Agency (NPSA) released a rapid response alert 'Checking pregnancy before surgery'.<sup>3</sup>

*Emma Sharkey FRCA is a Specialist Registrar in Anaesthesia at University College Hospital, London, UK. Conflicts of interests: none declared.*

*Siân Griffiths FRCA LLM is a Consultant Anaesthetist at Guy's and St. Thomas' Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK. Conflicts of interests: none declared.*

## Learning objectives

After reading this article, you should be able to:

- understand the importance of establishing pregnancy status in adolescent females prior to anaesthesia, surgery or exposure to ionizing radiation
- discuss the ethical considerations for routine pregnancy testing in this age group
- be aware of the guidelines issued by the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health

Similar guidance exists in the United States where it is recommended, but not mandated, that pregnancy testing is offered to all women of childbearing age. Routine pregnancy testing of all adolescent girls remains controversial but it is recognized that continuing with a procedure in a patient who may be pregnant would be unwise.

NICE guidance did not define 'childbearing' age, but the NPSA reported some organizations have interpreted this to mean 12–55 years. Over 21% of British girls have their first menstrual period before their 12th birthday and pregnancy has been reported below this age group.<sup>4</sup>

## Teenage pregnancy in the UK

Although the teenage pregnancy rate in the UK, is falling it is still the highest in Western Europe.<sup>4</sup> In 2013, conception rates in England and Wales for under 16 year olds was 4.9 per 1000.<sup>5</sup> Up to 70% of these pregnancies occurred in 15-year-olds and 62% of these girls chose to terminate their pregnancy. Based on a total of 60,000 surgical procedures in females aged 12–15 years, there are between 100 and 150 unrecognized pregnancies every year that are wanted. Although the incidence of unknown pregnancy in this age group is very low, there remains a duty to protect both the patient and fetus.

## Risks of anaesthesia or surgery when pregnant

Up to 15% of women with a known pregnancy miscarry during the first 20 weeks and up to half of unrecognized pregnancies are lost in the first trimester.<sup>1</sup> Some studies suggest that there may be an increased incidence of spontaneous abortion and very-low and low-birth weight infants following exposure to anaesthesia in the first or second trimester.<sup>1,6</sup> Other studies have shown an association between first trimester surgery and anaesthesia and the risk of congenital abnormalities, specifically neural tube defects and hydrocephalus.<sup>7</sup>

Scientific evidence does not, however, clearly demonstrate an association between early pregnancy and teratogenicity or miscarriage and in reality a single exposure to modern anaesthetics has not been shown to have an adverse effect on early pregnancy. In practice though, the clinical management differs when the patient is known to be pregnant.<sup>2</sup> Many planned procedures can be delayed until the second trimester or deferred until the patient is not pregnant.<sup>7</sup> Alternatively, if the procedure must be performed, the surgical or anaesthetic technique can be

modified.<sup>8</sup> By being aware of the existence of a pregnancy, the clinical team and patient can discuss the options available.

### Establishing pregnancy status

National guidance states patients should be asked sensitively about the possibility of pregnancy and offered a pregnancy test with their consent if there is uncertainty.<sup>2</sup> However, ascertaining pregnancy status in adolescents is challenging.

A study by Donaldson et al. demonstrated inconsistency when enquiring about pregnancy status in girls.<sup>4</sup> Their local survey revealed 35% of nurses relied on girls' appearance or behaviour as a trigger to enquire. Under 16-year-old girls may be sensitive to questioning about their menstrual history and sexual history. They may be reluctant to admit that they might be pregnant especially if asked in the presence of their parents or carers.<sup>8</sup> There may also be a fear of legal recrimination if admitting to under age sexual activity.<sup>9</sup> This discussion has the potential to add further anxiety to what many young girls will perceive to be a stressful experience when presenting for surgery.

Teenage girls may have erratic menstrual cycles that might make it difficult to accurately recall dates of their last menstrual period, which in itself is an unreliable indicator of pregnancy.<sup>8</sup> The patient may also be unaware that they are pregnant.

### Consent

Children over 16 years of age are presumed competent to consent to treatment, and this includes pregnancy testing. This does not apply to refusal of treatment. Children under 16 years must be *Gillick competent*, that is, they must be able to show they can understand the nature and implications of the proposed treatment, including the risks and alternative options.<sup>10</sup>

Donaldson et al. proposed routine testing for all girls who have reached menarche.<sup>4</sup> It has been argued that routine testing helps to standardize the management. While pregnancy testing has excellent reliability there are occasions when a false positive result may occur, such as quiescent trophoblastic disease, which may cause unnecessary stress to the patient.<sup>8</sup>

On the other hand, many would consider mandatory pregnancy testing an intrusion into a patient's autonomy.<sup>8</sup> A Gillick competent child has arguably as much right to confidentiality with pregnancy testing as she does for other procedures.<sup>9</sup> The preoperative assessment does not always allow for this confidentiality. An adolescent may be expected to disclose confidential information with parents or carers present placing them in a difficult situation.

### Ethical considerations for mandatory pregnancy testing

Routine testing to identify a minority of pregnancies that are not disclosed or not known about may seem disproportionate. Many of these young women are likely to request a termination and by protecting this minority there is the potential for harming relationships between all patients and their parents or carers.

The cost of routine testing that will identify a minority of unknown pregnancies must be balanced against the wider cost implications that may ensue if a complication results from proceeding.<sup>7</sup> This could include potential litigation from a spontaneous miscarriage or healthcare costs associated with the management of a congenital anomaly.

Consent for testing should be determined by capacity rather than age alone.<sup>7</sup> However, others would argue that it is unethical to expose a patient and fetus to potentially harmful clinical procedures.<sup>8</sup> Seeking explicit consent also poses ethical considerations. Refusal of testing may be as informative as a positive pregnancy test. In adolescents the consent process may be seen as acknowledgement of sexual activity.

### Guidance by the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health


Guidelines published by the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (RCPCH) in 2012 establish an evidence-based approach to assess pregnancy status in children under 16 years of age.<sup>11</sup> This guidance was issued to improve patient safety, encourage informed decision making, and provide consistency in management. They recognize the challenges posed by the adolescents and strive to balance the importance of determining pregnancy status against inappropriate questioning when sexual activity is unlikely.

The RCPCH guidelines suggest that clinicians responsible for the procedure should agree local policies that reflect a balance of risks. Procedures carrying a significant risk to a pregnant patient and/or fetus, e.g. scoliosis correction surgery, require a pregnancy test. However, selective enquiry may be sufficient for low risk procedures. A suggested flow sheet is illustrated in [Figure 1](#). The flow sheet was developed around several key beliefs:

- Pre-admission patient information helps to reduce embarrassment and sensitivity around questions about pregnancy on admission.
- Age of onset of menarche is wide (7–17 years). However, prevalence data suggests the incidence of pregnancy in under 13 year olds presenting for clinical diagnosis or treatment is negligible.
- Procedures that are high risk to an undisclosed pregnancy may make consent for testing of urine more appropriate in adolescents as direct enquiry may risk not detecting all pregnancies.
- Professional judgment must be applied to ascertain Gillick competence before establishing pregnancy status.
- As a minimum, verbal consent for testing must be documented.
- All females have a right to be asked about a potential pregnancy in confidence, separate from parents or carers. All information should be treated confidentially unless there is a safeguarding issue.
- Positive tests should be repeated, along with a blood test to confirm a pregnancy. A senior member of the team must discuss the result of the test, along with what it means for that particular procedure with the patient. With the permission of the patient, and for patients not deemed competent, parents or carers should be encouraged to join the discussions.

A separate flowchart is described for the management of patients requiring ionizing radiation. In addition, specific guidance is issued for patients presenting for emergency procedures where, in general, they must be managed by the multidisciplinary team on an individual basis.

Pre-procedure pregnancy checking in under-16s: guidance for clinicians



Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, November 2012.<sup>11</sup>

Figure 1

### Considerations for routine pregnancy testing in under 16 year olds

#### Arguments for routine preoperative testing

- Potential risk of fetal injury or loss, and cost of any litigation
- Risk of maternal complications
  - unrecognized physiology of pregnancy
- Lack of reliable patient history
- Avoidance of awkward questioning about sexual history

#### Arguments against routine preoperative testing

- Unclear relationship between anaesthesia and fetal harm/loss
- Low incidence of pregnancy in this group of patients
- Ethical and legal concerns regarding pregnancy testing in under 16 years
- Possibility of harming patient/carer and doctor relationship
- Possible false positive result

**Table 1**

### Safeguarding

The local designated nurse and/or doctor for child protection should be informed if:

- A child under the age of 13 years admits to sexual activity as, in law, they are not deemed competent to consent.
- A child aged 14–16 years with a positive pregnancy test. Ideally, the child's consent to disclose the information should be obtained.

For children over 16 years of age with a positive pregnancy test, healthcare professionals should encourage the young person to inform their parents or carers and GP.

### Pregnancy testing of adolescents participating in research

Larcher and Brierley reviewed the ethical and legal implications of pregnancy testing in clinical trials involving adolescents, and provided guidance to support researchers.<sup>12</sup> The need for pregnancy testing should be clearly stated in the research protocol. Researchers should receive training to act within the framework provided in clinical practice. For clinical trials of medicinal product, pregnancy testing requires parental consent and the child's involvement in the decision-making, i.e. 'assent' for children aged 13–15 years of age.

In summary, there are multiple ethical considerations when considering pregnancy testing in children under 16 years old

(Table 1). Recommendations by the RCPCH allow the development of departmental guidelines that aim to minimize harm to the patient while ensuring departments comply with national standards of care. ◆

### REFERENCES

- 1 Brodsky JB, Cohen EN, Brown Jr BW, et al. Surgery during pregnancy and fetal outcome. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1980; **138**: 1165–7.
- 2 NICE guideline [NG45]. Routine preoperative tests for elective surgery. April 2016. London: NICE, <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng45/chapter/Recommendations#pregnancy-tests> (accessed 29th April 2019).
- 3 Lamont T, Coates T, Mathew D, et al. Checking for pregnancy before surgery: summary of a safety report from the National Patient Safety Agency. *BMJ* 2010; **341**: c3402.
- 4 Donaldson JF, Napier SJ, Ward-Jones M, et al. Checking pregnancy status in adolescent girls before procedures under general anaesthesia. *Arch Dis Child* 2012; **97**: 895–9.
- 5 Office for National Statistics. Statistical bulletin: conceptions in England and Wales. 2013. Available at: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/vsob1/conception-statistics-england-and-wales/2013/stb-conceptions-in-england-and-wales-2013.html> (accessed 29th April 2019).
- 6 Duncan PG, Pope WD, Cohen MM, et al. Fetal risk of anesthesia and surgery during pregnancy. *Anesthesiology* 1986; **64**: 790–4.
- 7 Kahn R, Stanton M, Tong-Ngork S, et al. One-year experience with day-of-surgery pregnancy testing before elective orthopaedic procedures. *Anesth Analg* 2008; **106**: 1127–31.
- 8 Short J. Pregnancy testing guidance. Insights from the American Literature. November 2012. Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health. Available at: [https://www.rcpch.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Review\\_of\\_US\\_literature.pdf](https://www.rcpch.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Review_of_US_literature.pdf) (accessed 29th April 2019).
- 9 Wheeler R. Competent for confidence at 12 years of age? *Arch Dis Child* 2012; **97**: 180–1.
- 10 Gillick v West Norfolk & Wisbech area health authority, 1986. AC 112 (HL).
- 11 Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health. Pre-procedure pregnancy checking in under 16s: guidance for clinicians. November 2012. Also available at: <http://www.rcpch.ac.uk/system/files/protected/page/pregnancy%20checking%20guidance%20final.pdf> (accessed 29th April 2019).
- 12 Larcher V, Brierley J. Developing guidance for pregnancy testing of adolescents participating in research: ethical, legal and practical considerations. *Arch Dis Child* 2016; **101**: 980–3.