IJTICPN-International Journal of trends in Intensive Care and Pediatric Nursing

Volume 2, Issue 1 | Feb-2025

e-ISSN: 3065-8004 PRINT ISSN 3065-7997

Ethical Challenges of Resource Allocation in Pediatric Intensive Care Units

Neha Verma

Research Scholar, Department of Pediatric Nursing, All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), New Delhi, India

Received: 23-12-2024; Revised: 13-01-2025; Accepted: 21-01-2025; Published: 18-02-2025

Abstract

PICUs encounter major ethical challenges in their resource allocation processes because life-saving priorities need to be selected from limited resources. A refined ethical framework is needed to manage the three core needs of medical necessity, equity alongside justice while achieving excellent patient results. When rationing occurs in PICUs the allocation of ventilators along with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), critical care beds and lifesaving treatments becomes highly complex. Ethical problems occur when making decisions to prioritize medical care between patients whose health conditions vary in terms of long-term status and social health factors. Healthcare providers together with their teams perform these decisions through ethical principles including beneficence along with non-maleficence and autonomy and justice under guidance from hospital policies and legal mandates and societal expectations. Healthcare providers experience enhanced moral distress because of conflicts that develop between professionals who deliver treatment and families along with institutional guidelines about continued treatment versus discontinuation. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed existing resource challenges so medical professionals require standardized distribution protocols to prevent biased resource allocation. The research analyzes ethical dilemmas which occur during medicine rationing in pediatric intensive care units in combination with ethics committee involvement and possible methods to distribute resources fairly. Both ethical guidance enforcement alongside teamwork between different medical specialties alongside family updates about care plans will help healthcare providers make challenging treatment decisions while preserving pediatric rights and patient wellness.

Keywords: ***Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, resource allocation, medical ethics, rationing, critical care ethics, healthcare justice, beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, moral distress, equity in healthcare, pediatric end-of-life care, COVID-19, ethical frameworks in medicine.***

1.Introduction

Healthcare rationing continues to generate ethical disputes among experts who work in pediatric intensive care. Healthcare providers experience discomfort when they need to make bedside rationing decisions about medical resource distribution because rationing concepts receive systemic recognition and policy-level acceptance. Children lack decision-making autonomy about healthcare treatment because they need parents and providers to protect their interests since they belong to a vulnerable healthcare category. The lack of political agency in children makes it essential for healthcare rationing decisions to address their particular needs and susceptible circumstances because they cannot directly impact healthcare system policies(1).

Throughout history the government along with health institutions properly used rationing techniques to distribute scarce healthcare resources against unmeasured medical requirements.Bedside rationing responsibilities increase ethical complexity since individual healthcare providers need to determine which patient receives the most urgent care. The process of making difficult healthcare decisions creates distress for professionals because it runs counter to their core ethical duty to offer maximum patient welfare. Medical ethics faces serious jeopardy when healthcare providers restrict treatment for financial reasons since these policies violate the cornerstone principles of beneficence combined with nonmaleficence.

Healthcare providers now face healthcare rationing decisions more strongly because the coronavirus pandemic revealed how hospital resource scarcity generates complex choices(2). The worldwide surge of hospital patients especially within intensive care units (ICUs) forced physicians to choose which patients would receive critical equipment like ventilators and specialized treatment. Healthcare staff performed bedside rationing because its

implementation became immediate and vital daily practice in these situations. Various ethical guidelines emerged swiftly at an international scale to guide medical professionals through the process of making tough decisions. Considering rationing as acceptable during emergencies leads to a dilemma because healthcare providers avoid acknowledging that everyday medical practice involves the same rationing decisions.

The study aims to investigate rationing practices in pediatric intensive care units since they represent ethical or unethical procedures. The paper explores distributive justice theories and operational rationing frameworks which were implemented throughout the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. The analysis in this article disputes the accepted truth that rationing is a practice limited to critical scarcity conditions. The article presents a contrary perspective stating that rationing manifests as a continuous implicit process which occurs through normal medical routines such as nursing personnel distribution and daily physician appointment distribution decisions with patients.

The main problem with bedside rationing is that it can easily become influenced by unconscious assumptions. Individual decision-making at the point of care determines bedside rationing decisions although such judgments tend to reflect unconscious biases stemming from a patient's social characteristics and behavioral patterns or economic status. Prejudices unintentionally cause care to be distributed unequally between patients thus resulting in unfair treatment for some individuals. The article examines these biases through their manifestation behavior as well as their effects on clinical decisions together with strategies to combat their consequences(3).

This paper suggests various methods to increase transparency alongside fairness in bedside rationing practices. The methods for improving bedside rationing include motivating practitioners to reflect on their decisions while enhancing teamwork and setting definite resource distribution rules and building an environment supporting medical workers to challenge and discuss rationing choices. The recommended procedures seek to establish both ethical value and fairness alongside maximum responsibility across bedside rationing choices.

The paper explores pediatric intensive care ethics but its principles extend to all medical specialties including critical care units and emergency departments and limited healthcare systems. This article emphasizes bedside rationing complexities to help develop a more ethical transparent approach toward resource allocation in healthcare delivery.

2. Section Rewritten: Background Information on Healthcare Rationing Theory

Modern medicine requires healthcare rationing because it occurs when medical care benefits are denied or delayed to patients because healthcare resources are limited. Rationing should be distinguished from medical futility decision making processes in healthcare institutions. The absence of medical resources to support all potentially beneficial patients leads to the need for deciding which patients will receive care based on limited availability. The medical procedure is withheld if a physician determines that it would not lead to any patient benefit regardless of resources available. The difference between rationing and witholding medicine remains essential since people commonly mistake rationing decisions for medical negligence although it serves healthcare management needs but must be conducted ethically.

The responsibility to make rationing decisions remains one of the most debated aspects when discussing healthcare rationing. A group of scholars supports governmental institutions and executive bodies to handle rationing duties by creating structured resource distribution frameworks. The approach suggests that healthcare institutions should utilize funding policies together with regulations and institutional directives to establish rationing criteria instead of leaving decisions at the direct patient care level. The supporters of this view state that any requirement for clinicians to make rationing choices conflicts with their ethical obligation to advocate for their patients which appears in most medical and nursing codes of ethics. The American Medical Association Code of Ethics recommends physicians to maintain patient well-being regardless of external factors which implies resource limitations should not influence patient care decisions. Nurses according to the International Council of Nurses should support social justice and healthcare access which clashes with their main professional duties therefore suggests rationing participation would be dangerous.

Multiple experts recognize rationing exists in two levels though policy officials present it as a declaration made at high policy positions which contradicts the actual reality that medical professionals introduce bedside rationing actions regardless of their knowledge. Every medical establishment faces resource constraints which render complete and equal treatment of patients throughout all times impossible. The PICU medical team regularly implies rationing choices when deciding which patient needs urgent help or what diagnostic exams need immediate execution or how nurses should be distributed. Decision-making influences the process of care distribution to patients even when these decisions fail to meet the criteria for formal rationing(4).

Volume 2, Issue 1 | Feb-2025

e-ISSN: 3065-8004 PRINT ISSN 3065-7997

Proponents behind bedside rationing recognize that although it makes patients uncomfortable it might become necessary in certain instances. Healthcare workers who deny their participation in rationing decisions will support decision-making that lacks ethical thought or is influenced by unfiltered biases. Given that bedside rationing exists regardless of resistance it is better to establish ethical framework systems which enable healthcare providers to perform well-informed and objective decision-making processes. At policy and bedside levels ethical theories based on utilitarianism and distributive justice enable the creation of ethical rationing decisions through maximizing overall benefit and ensuring fair resource allocation.

Norman Daniels and James Sabin present "accountability for reasonableness" as the most successful method to achieve fair healthcare restrictions. The framework establishes four conditions which require rationing decisions to be publicly accessible and defensible as well as subject to review and backed by legal consequences. The decision-making process under this model should involve principles which prevent arbitrary basis or personal bias from guiding decisions. During the COVID-19 pandemic healthcare systems deployed clear protocols for hospital triage which determined who received critical care facilities. These emergency protocols reveal crucial information about establishing ethical resource distribution methods that clinical teams can use regularly.

The choice about healthcare rationing rests in ethical processes because it remains inevitable in healthcare systems. The paper maintains that healthcare workers must gain skills and methods for executing bedside rationing decisions through transparent and equitable approaches(5). The establishment of ethical practices must safeguard patients as well as healthcare personnel to execute rationing decisions in both fair and evidence-supported ways.

3. The Context of COVID-19 Rationing

The medical field had to face bedside rationing openly and publicly for the first time throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. The worldwide surge of critical patients in hospitals became the clear indicator that healthcare systems had their resource limits leading to life-decision making about patient care access. The medical system in Italy along with other impacted countries experienced horrible shortages of equipment such as ventilators along with ICU beds and medical staff in their hospitals. The fast-growing numbers of COVID-19 patients surpassed hospital capacity to the point where necessary triage systems needed to be put into practice to decide which patients qualified for vital treatments through age-related and patient survival chance and medical condition checks. Healthcare professionals alongside policymakers needed to create new guidelines for fair resource distribution after the extreme circumstances compelled them to address ethical and logistical rationing problems.

Many medical institutions with countries adopted formal ethical guidelines to direct decisions regarding Intensive Care Unit medical resource distribution. These frameworks served two purposes: ensuring fair decision-making processes and minimizing discrimination in choices and providing visible explanations for each decision. Guidelines based on ethical considerations established strict procedures for rationing decisions that had to rely on impartial methods rather than clinician personal preference(6). Establishment of specialized triage teams outside frontline medical staff offered recommendations from most ethical frameworks since it would help reduce anxiety burden on doctors and nurses who faced continuous stress and moral conflict.

The ethical guidelines introduced the "tipping point" terminology which the literature called "triage threshold". Medical systems reach this critical point because standard care delivery becomes impossible for all patients leading to implementation of emergency response management protocols. The usual process for admitting patients to ICU relies on clinical requirements together with expected outcomes and recovery possibilities. The strategy changes from maximizing patient survival and resource allocation efficiency when the hospital reaches the tipping point. Organizations will deny intensive care to patients who have poorer survival prospects or require elevated medical resources since priority will go to persons who stand to gain better outcomes from treatment. Healthcare professionals faced thorny ethical issues regarding care denial decisions after the pandemic started because such measures were ethically necessary in crisis situations.

The established frameworks did not eliminate the implementation struggles which frontline medical staff faced when using triage protocols. Medical staff experienced psychological turmoil because they had to decide which patients would receive care while their professional ethics demanded to treat every sick individual. Healthcare workers found rationing activities became stressful both with and without clear direction especially when family members didn't

understand care restrictions and disagreed with care priority rules. Experiments revealed that particular patient populations from lower socioeconomic groups and racial minorities faced increased chance of being denied admission to ICU by healthcare providers. The observed disparities emphasised the importance of transparent and accountable decision-making in rationing together with continued assessment and possibly updating of triage protocols(7).

Medical practice demonstrates that rationing exists in everyday care even though the COVID-19 crisis made such decisions more conspicuous than usual. The ethical problems regarding resource distribution became more apparent during the pandemic yet offered critical information to develop standardized resource rationing procedures. The valuable insights from the COVID-19 pandemic must be transferred to regular healthcare facilities so both pandemic and everyday bedsides use ethical principles along with equitable protocols and transparent processes in their rationing decisions.

4. Rationing in the absence of a pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic made rationing ethical challenges visible to the world but medical systems continue to make rationing choices throughout regular practice through implicit yet constant methods. Under ordinary circumstances healthcare professionals in well-supplied systems regularly decide to prioritize between patients and medical interventions due to limited healthcare resources. Matter-of-fact crisis triage protocols operate through structured frameworks accessible to staff members but day-to-day rationing begins without standardized protocols and remains internalized within medical staff. The ethical impact of these selection choices requires examination regarding their basis of decision making and who gets affected along with the considerations about fairness and justice.

Medical attention and time allocation stands as the most prevalent form of daily rationing processes. In PICU morning ward rounds a physician dedicates extensive time to explain the treatment approach of critical children before moving on to brief assessments of medically stable patients(8). The nurse would give preference to treating a postoperative patient experiencing severe pain instead of dealing with a child who needs standard medical procedures. These apparently inconsequential choices together determine which patients receive the best treatment while additional patients must wait for medical aid.

Rationing permeates throughout hospital processes that relate both to staff organization and patient care delivery. Hospital administrators decide to provide additional help to specific units when nursing shortages happen but they must distribute limited staffing between different departments. When the PICU demands high patient care the decision to give critical cases to well-versed nurses can result in new nursing staff handling multiple less-serious patients which could diminish their care quality. Although clinically necessary the made decisions represent how rationing occurs in real medical care settings.

The widespread occurrence of bedside rationing in regular care services causes substantial distress because medical staff are reluctant to recognize its persistent existence. Healthcare providers refrain from resource-based decision making because they hold the practice standard that medical care should revolve entirely around clinical requirements. Healthcare providers often see themselves as advocates who put patients before all else so they struggle to merge rationing realities with their ethical obligation to give equal and fair treatment to every patient. When implicit rationing is untreated completely it may create hidden biases that cause specific patients to get inappropriate medical attention because of factors outside of medical needs such as how well their family communicates and their personal history and healthcare staff preferences.

People draw distinctions between normal resource management activities they perform in healthcare and genuine rationing procedures which they classify as resource allocation or stewardship. Resource allocation allows available resources to reach their most efficient use says the advocate group while differentiating from authentic rationing practices which strip patients of all their treatment options. The distinction between resource allocation and rationing faces opposition from those who maintain their ethical positions are similar. The choice-making process for distributing a limited medical resource occurs through both methods regardless of different terminology. The primary issue involves how fairly and ethically decisions are made transparently instead of whether the decisions should be made at all.

Medical professionals must increase transparency while practicing ethical reflection in everyday medical decisions because implicit biases affect rationing practices at the bedside. Research demonstrates that both racial identity and socioeconomic background together with patients' perceived compliance elements affect clinicians' assessments regarding treatment distribution. The lack of formal guidance processes alongside implicit bias consciousness allows

Volume 2, Issue 1 | Feb-2025
e-ISSN: 3065-8004 PRINT ISSN 3065-7997

primary healthcare rationing decisions to perpetuate past health segregation patterns by placing particular social groups at greater risk for disadvantage.

Healthcare institutions must focus on building reflective clinical practice that lets practitioners identify resource limitations and unconscious bias effects on their daily decisions. Healthcare institutions can improve fairness and consistency in everyday medical care through the development of ethical frameworks which parallel the ethical guidelines created for COVID-19 rationing. Hospitals can achieve ethical rationing methods by implementing open discussions about resource distribution and providing equal medical care to all patients.

5. The Morality of "Daily" Rationing in PICU

Pediatric intensive care unit (PICU) creates multiple ethically complicated situations for everyday resource allocation decisions. Children receiving treatments in PICU need healthcare professionals and caregivers to decide their care because they lack the ability to self-advocate like adult patients do in regular healthcare facilities. The situation creates deep ethical dilemmas concerning which scarce resources should receive distribution first during times of excess demand. Pediatric medicine follows a long-established principle known as the rule of rescue because medical staff must exhaust all measures to save endangered children no matter the financial burden to healthcare. The values-based medical practices follow patient needs yet they frequently create ethical conflicts with distributive justice principles because healthcare resources should be distributed fairly to all beneficiaries(9).

Distributing healthcare resources at a patient's bedside in pediatric settings creates an enduring impact from all clinical decisions. When a physician directs added resources toward treating a child with a situation that happens rarely yet has treatment options it reduces the available medical resources needed by another child with a prevalent serious condition. Pediatric care clinicians experience heightened emotional attachments with young patients which makes objective healthcare rationing even harder because professionals find it difficult to choose between two critically ill children from their caseload. Healthcare providers avoid resource decisions near the patient because these decisions go against their patient advocacy role which creates moral distress for them.

Modern medicine relies on procedural justice systems to create standardized rationing decisions while improving their openness and fairness. The Truog taxonomy serves as a key model to analyze rationing practices in PICU environments through its classification of different rationing decisions into three central categories.

Random choices occur when health care facilities reach their capacity thus restricting medical options for patients. The PICU's maximum capacity force physicians to pick which critical children receive immediate admission while others must occupy available beds. Ethical consistency during unavoidable implementation of these decisions helps avoid both discrimination and favoritism.

Many medical facilities operate under established procedures that determine distribution protocols in cases of resource limitations. Under hospital guidelines postoperative pediatric cardiac patients obtain preferred admission to the ICU because of their increased surgical complication risk. Such guidelines make sure that decisions apply equally to all cases which helps combat personal bias.

Rationing decisions based on clinical judgment present the most ethical complexity since their implementation demands healthcare providers to evaluate and select the patients who need urgent care. The process of clinical judgment rationing differs from hospital policies since it depends heavily on doctors' personal backgrounds and mental biases along with their subjective beliefs. Medical professionals provide longer care to linguistic groups who communicate well but incidents of language barrier neglect occur unintentionally toward families without fluent language skills.

Implicit bias poses a significant ethical problem because it influences the rationing distributor choices. The delivery of priority care in pediatric settings depends on four key factors that include socioeconomic status together with race and gender and parental advocacy. Research indicates that children from upper-class families get fast specialist appointments because their parents understand healthcare systems and pursue referrals persistently although underprivileged children wait longer and receive less medical care. The healthcare decisions of professionals tend to prioritize patients without disabilities or complex medical needs at times leading to inappropriate care delays(10).

The situation demands PICUs to establish proactive ethical and equitable decision-making systems for rationing procedures. Some recommended strategies include:

Alternative healthcare personnel should practice self-reflection to uncover their unconscious preconceptions together with the way they affect their medical choices.
Healthcare institutions must create guidelines founded in evidence which deliver step-by-step instruction for practitioners to perform bedside rationing processes.
Decision-making committees should exist to assess and evaluate rationing decisions so doctors can maintain fairness and receive accountability.
Measures should focus on creating open dialogue between health professionals and patient relatives and hospital executives to authorize sound rationing actions.
Medical facilities must create an ethical review system which allows patients or their proxies to appeal bedside rationing decisions. This system should also enable reviews of any rationing decision which needs reappraisal.
The necessity of bedside rationing in PICU requires medical staff to maintain both strict ethical standards and clear disclosure practices while showing equal treatment to patients at all times. Medical professionals should recognize typical rationing situations in pediatric medicine to create intentional strategies which minimize bias while advancing decision-making methods and thus delivering optimal care with limited resources.

6.Conclusion and Future work

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed that healthcare rationing becomes necessary in all medical settings including high-risk Pediatric Intensive Care Units (PICUs). The critical care resource shortage brought by the pandemic prevented health providers from giving equal service to all patients which resulted in heartbreaking choices about who would receive emergency treatments. The public became aware of healthcare rationing issues during the pandemic but hospitals implement such decisions regularly throughout the global healthcare network.
A widespread avoidance to address bedside rationing ethics persists among clinical practitioners hospital administrators together with policymakers since public acknowledgment of these decisions allegedly demonstrates neglect and inequity or moral insufficiency. The choice to avoid resource-allocation discussions does not stop rationing in healthcare facilities but instead leads to random and inconsistent delivery of care as well as biases sneaking into the system. The real issue surrounds locating a just and morally sound approach to rationing rather than the decision to implement it.
The primary ethical problem with bedside rationing occurs when such decisions are made without clear directions and mechanisms for accountability. Medical professionals resolve time distribution and decision-making regarding procedures along with resource allocation without established direction for their assessment process. Everyday healthcare choices shape which patients obtain quicker medical assistance and extended medical staff time and delayed care times for other patients. Clinical judgment about resource management features implicit biases that stem either from conscious awareness or nonconscious factors based on patients' socioeconomic status and racial background and their caregivers' advocacies and perceived treatment cooperation. The result of these decisions creates healthcare inequality because some children receive better benefits which others do not obtain.
Medical institutions and hospitals should create structured decision processes for rationing decisions because this enhances ethical fairness and transparency and achieves consistent outcomes. The ethical model developed by Daniels and Sabin's "accountability for reasonableness" framework defines key principles which guide the ethical conduct of rationing decisions:
The rationing criteria need to communicate openly to both medical staff and families of patients.
Objective medical need should determine clinically relevant decisions whereas subjective impressions and personal preferences should not be used for decision-making.
Healthcare providers together with patients and their families should maintain opportunities to present objections regarding rationing decisions through formal review procedures.
Hospitals require tracking systems which monitor their resource allocation programs while developing methods to enhance these policies moving forward.
The management of implicit bias in rationing requires both educational programs and training for clinical providers. Through reflective practice programs including bias awareness workshops and ethical case discussions along with morbidity and mortality reviews medical staff can both study their choice-making approaches and detect unconscious biases affecting patient treatment outcomes. Patient care decisions based on team collaboration create more accountable and fair processes within PICU environments instead of using individual clinician judgements.

Volume 2, Issue 1 | Feb-2025

e-ISSN: 3065-8004 PRINT ISSN 3065-7997

Medical facilities need to implement open communication mechanisms which show families the systems used to make distribution choices. Most families of patients do not understand how shortages of medical staff and ICU beds along with constrained supply affect their child's level of care. Hospitals should use honest and compassionate communications to establish trust between healthcare providers and families which decreases confusion during difficult allocation decision periods.

Healthcare providers face significant mental challenges in connection with the rationing process which needs attention. The feeling of emotional discomfort that providers experience from failing to deliver required care disrupts their emotional well-being which eventually develops into burnout as well as anxiety and job dissatisfaction. Healthcare establishments should establish resources and programs which both assist clinicians to address ethical decision-making situations together with mental health services to help medical staff manage decision-related emotional stress.

Acknowledgement: Nil

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare

References

1. Lantos JD, Meadow W. Resource Allocation in Pediatric Intensive Care: Beyond Bedside Decisions. Pediatrics. 2006;118(1):224-228.
2. Kissoon N, Argent A, Devictor D, et al. Resource Allocation and Health Care Reform. Pediatric Critical Care Medicine. 2005;6(3):S157-S162.
3. Morrison W, Womer J, Nathanson P, et al. Pediatric Intensive Care Unit Nurses' Perceptions of Clinician-Family Interactions. J Pediatr Nurs. 2008;23(4):317-325.
4. Burns JP, Truog RD. Futility: A Concept in Evolution. Chest. 2007;132(6):1987-1993.
5. Garros D, Rosychuk RJ, Cox PN. Circumstances Surrounding End of Life in a Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. Pediatrics. 2003;112(5):e371-e379.
6. Carnevale FA, Canouï P, Cremer R, et al. Ethics in Pediatric Intensive Care. Ann Intensive Care. 2013;3(1):14.
7. Meadow W, Lantos J. Moral Reflections on Neonatal Intensive Care. Pediatrics. 2009;123(2):595-597.
8. Boss RD, Hutton N, Sulpar LJ, West AM, Donohue PK. Values Parents Apply to Decision-Making Regarding Delivery Room Resuscitation for High-Risk Newborns. Pediatrics. 2008;122(3):583-589.
9. Janvier A, Nadeau S, Deschênes M, Couture E, Barrington KJ. Moral Distress in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit: Caregiver's Experience. J Perinatol. 2007;27(4):203-208.
10. Michelson KN, Ryan AD, Jovanovic B, Frader J. Pediatric Intensive Care Unit Family Conferences: One Mode of Communication for Discussing End-of-Life Care Decisions. Pediatr Crit Care Med. 2009;10(3):326-331.