Review Article

Informed Consent in Healthcare: Ethical Principles, Legal Dimensions, Clinical Evidence, and Emerging Perspectives

Dr. Maroof Bashir[1], Adv. Ashlesha Mulay[2], Dr. Sujata A. Gaikwad[3]
1 Principal, St Wilfred's College of law, Panvel, Maharastra, India.
2 Assistant Professor, St Wilfred's College of law, Panvel, Maharastra, India.
3 Associate Professor, Department of Physiology, MGM Medical College, Vashi, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.
***Corresponding author's E-mail:** sgaikwadggmc@gmail.com

Received: 08-02-2026; **Revised:** 26-03-2026; **Accepted:** 05-04-2026; **Published online:** 20-04-2026.

ABSTRACT

Informed consent far beyond a signed document is an ongoing communicative process central to patient autonomy, shared decision-making, and ethical integrity in both clinical practice and research. Despite its foundational role in contemporary healthcare, evidence suggests that comprehension of informed consent remains limited among patients and research participants, raising serious ethical concerns. The concept of informed consent is embedded in the principles of Nuremberg Code, the Declaration of Helsinki and the Belmont Report. Informed consent is an inevitable requirement prior to every research involving human beings as subjects for study. Obtaining consent involves informing the subject about his or her rights, the purpose of the study, potential risks and benefits of participation, procedures, expected duration of study, extent of confidentiality of personal identification and demographic data, so that the participation of subjects in the study is entirely voluntary. This paper presents an original, comprehensive analysis of informed consent, integrating ethical theory, legal frameworks, challenges and best practice in the informed consent process.

Keywords: Informed consent, patient autonomy, ethics, law, healthcare research, clinical practice.

INTRODUCTION

Informed consent (IC) constitutes a core ethical and legal obligation in research, requiring that participants voluntarily enrol only after receiving comprehensive information about potential risks, anticipated benefits, and available alternatives. This concept is firmly grounded in the principle of respect for autonomy, which upholds an individual's right to make informed and independent decisions regarding participation in medical research.[1] The acquisition of informed consent is not a mere procedural step; rather, it is a continuous, interactive process that encourages open communication between the researcher and the participant, thereby strengthening transparency, understanding, and trust throughout the clinical trial. Informed consent has been traced, or rather projected into the past, to the Hippocratic Oath. The process started as a reaction to the numerous human research experiments carried out without the consent of the patient in the 20th century. The model for consent established in the Nuremberg Code has continued to evolve through the many revisions of the Declaration of Helsinki, Institutional review boards now oversee the process of research.[2]

The informed consent process is widely understood as comprising several essential elements: voluntariness, ability, disclosure, comprehension, and decision .[3,4,5] Voluntariness refers to an individual's decision to join without pressure or influence. Capacity refers to a person's capacity to make judgments based on his or her understanding of the information presented. Disclosure entails providing research participants with comprehensive information about the study's nature, purpose, risks, benefits, and alternatives.[6] Understanding refers to study participants comprehending and appreciating facts relevant to their particular experiences. The decision is taken to participate or not.[4,5,7]

Numerous empirical studies have demonstrated that patients and research participants often have limited understanding of key consent elements, particularly risks, probabilities, alternatives, and research-specific concepts such as randomization or placebo use .[8,9] Factors contributing to poor comprehension include low health literacy, language barriers, emotional distress, time constraints in clinical settings, and overly complex consent documents. In many cases, consent forms are written at a reading level far above that of the average patient, reducing their effectiveness as tools for communication. These shortcomings undermine the ethical purpose of informed consent by transforming it into a symbolic or ritualistic exercise rather than a genuine process of understanding and choice. Voluntariness is indispensable element of valid consent. A decision can only be considered ethically acceptable if it is made freely, without coercion, manipulation, or undue influence. In healthcare settings, voluntariness may be compromised by subtle power imbalances between healthcare providers and patients, financial pressures, fear of denial of care, or familial and social expectations. In certain cultural contexts, including many parts of India, patients may defer decision-making authority to physicians or family members, not necessarily because they lack capacity, but due to deeply ingrained social norms that value collective decision-making or physician authority. While such practices may reflect cultural values, they raise ethical concerns if patients' individual preferences are not adequately explored or

respected. Ensuring voluntariness therefore requires sensitivity to both individual autonomy and socio-cultural context.[10,11]

Documentation of informed consent acts as a legal and institutional safeguard by providing evidence that the consent process has taken place. However, it represents the conclusion of the process rather than a substitute for meaningful communication. A signed consent form alone does not ensure that the participant was fully informed, understood the information, or agreed voluntarily. Ethical guidelines, including the ICMR National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health-Related Research, emphasize that informed consent is a continuous process, particularly in long-term studies or when protocols or risk information change.[12] Despite strong ethical and regulatory frameworks, persistent gaps in patient understanding and deficiencies in consent documentation raise serious concerns about the practical realization of informed consent ideals. Studies have shown that many patients consent to procedures without fully appreciating potential risks or alternative options, while research participants may misunderstand the purpose of a study or overestimate personal benefits .[13,14] Such gaps not only compromise ethical standards but also erode public trust in healthcare and research institutions. The disconnect between normative principles and real-world practice suggests that informed consent, as currently implemented, often falls short of its intended goals. Recognizing these challenges, this paper adopts an integrative approach that synthesizes ethical theory, legal requirements, and empirical evidence to critically evaluate contemporary informed consent practices. It highlights structural, communicative, and cultural barriers that impede meaningful consent and examines emerging strategies aimed at improving patient comprehension and engagement. Particular attention is given to the Indian context, where linguistic diversity, varying literacy levels, and resource constraints necessitate context specific adaptations of consent processes. By aligning global ethical principles with national standards such as the ICMR National Ethical Guidelines, this paper proposes practical recommendations to strengthen informed consent as a patient-centered, ethically robust, and socially responsive process .[15]

Informed consent is an ethical and legal requirement for any research involving human participants. The concept of informed consent has a relatively short history but has become a fundamental principle in clinical research. The Nuremberg Code, developed after World War II in response to Nazi medical experiments, established for the first time the principle that informed consent is essential for ethical medical research. The Code and subsequent declarations, such as the Declaration of Helsinki, have reinforced the importance of informed consent as a critical safeguard of the principle of autonomy or respect for persons. The Declaration of Helsinki has been revised and updated over the years, but the statements regarding informed consent have remained largely unchanged. It is important to note that the principle of informed consent is continuously evolving with new laws and regulations, but the basic principle has been unaltered since inception, to ensure the autonomy and protection of human subjects in research. While technological innovations such as e-consent platforms offer new opportunities to enhance the consent process, researchers must remain vigilant to ensure that these tools are accessible and comprehensible to all participants, particularly those from vulnerable or underserved populations. As clinical trials continue to evolve in complexity, the ongoing challenge will be to balance the need for comprehensive information with the responsibility to ensure that participants are truly informed and able to make voluntary, autonomous decisions about their involvement in research .[16] Ultimately, enhancing informed consent is not merely a matter of regulatory compliance, but a moral imperative central to ethical healthcare and responsible research. A meaningful consent process affirms respect for persons, promotes trust, and upholds the dignity of those who place their health and well-being in the hands of medical professionals and researchers. The study aimed to provide a comprehensive overview of original, comprehensive analysis of informed consent, integrating ethical theory, legal frameworks, empirical evidence, challenges and best practice in the informed consent process.

METHODOLOGY:

In practice, different tools exist that facilitate literature searches, in addition to visiting a local library and communicating with peers. Using a combination of search terms from the PubMed, Medline databases, Cochrane Library databases, and manual searches on Google Scholar and the bibliographies of identified articles.

First informed consent

Informed Consent is a fundamental requirement for clinical research. The first informed consent documents were used by Major Walter Reed and the US Army Yellow Fever Commission exploring the transmission of Yellow Fever in Cuba in 1900. Despite this, formal documentation of informed consent was uncommon until after World War II. Human experimentation conducted on concentration camp prisoners by German physicians in World War II led to the drafting of the Nuremberg Code by Dr. Leo Alexander, a US physician who was the chief medical advisor to the U.S. Chief of Counsel for War Crimes. The Code had ten principles, the foremost of which was that involvement in research must be voluntary. This in turn led to the Declaration of Helsinki in 1964, issued by the World Medical Association, outlining the core principles for the ethical conduct of research in humans. This has subsequently been edited seven times. [16, 17]

In the Western world, the mentions of IC date back to the 18th century, also in the field of surgery. The orthopaedists Baker and Stapleton, without informing or obtaining prior approval from the patient (Slater), refractured and used an experimental medical device to align and straighten his non-union fractured leg, which was being treated with

bandages. In the judgment of the trial "*Slater vs Baker and Stapleton*" (1767), the court ruled in favour of the patient, saying that a patient should be informed of the procedure, so that he/she takes courage and charge of the situation, and can face the operation .[18]

Altschuler notes that one of the first descriptions of the concept of IC appears in Edgar Allen Poe's novel "*The facts of the case of M. Valdemar*" (1845), in which the protagonist asks Mr. Valdemar for permission to practice a hypnosis experiment on him before his death .[19] Suárez-Obando and Ordoñez and Vollmann and Winau identify the First and Second Prussian Directives on Research as the predecessors of today's IC in research .[20,21]

Historical Evolution of Informed Consent [22-25]

The historical evolution of informed consent reflects a gradual but profound transformation in healthcare ethics and law. From a paternalistic model focused solely on beneficence, medicine has moved toward a rights-based framework that values autonomy, transparency, and shared decision-making. Legal judgments and ethical codes have collectively reinforced the principle that neither professional expertise nor benevolent intent can justify overriding individual choice. These historical developments continue to shape contemporary debates on informed consent, particularly in complex areas such as biomedical research, digital health, and care of vulnerable populations. Understanding this evolution is essential for addressing present-day shortcomings and for designing consent processes that genuinely respect human dignity.

The Code of Nuremberg 1947: The code was the first significant international document to offer recommendations on research ethics and was created in reaction to the Nuremberg trials of Nazi physicians who conducted unethical experiments during World War II. In clinical research investigations, it mandated voluntary consent, highlighting that permission can only be voluntary if: Participants can provide their consent. They are not subject to external pressure or compulsion. They are aware of the advantages and hazards. Additionally, according to the code, researchers must limit risk and damage, ensure that risks do not materially exceed possible benefits, employ suitable study designs, and ensure that participants are free to discontinue participation at any time.

Declaration of Helsinki 1964: The Declaration of Helsinki, which was issued by the World Medical Association in Helsinki, Finland, established 12 guidelines for doctors about ethical issues pertaining to biomedical research. It highlights the difference between research that may or may not immediately assist patients and medical care that does. At later sessions in 1975, 1983, 1989, 2000, and 2008, these rules were updated.

The Belmont Report 1979: Three guiding principles for doing research ethically are outlined in the paper. Respect for individuals: Acknowledging people's individuality and dignity as well as the necessity of protecting those who have less autonomy (i.e., poor decision-making abilities), such as children, the elderly, and those with disabilities Beneficence An responsibility to minimize risks and maximize rewards in order to protect people from damage Justice: Equitable allocation of the advantages and costs associated with research. The Belmont Report describes, how these relate to research procedures; for instance, it states that informed consent is a procedure that is crucial to the respect principle.

CIOMS guidelines 1982: In 1982, the WHO and CIOMS created the International Ethical Guidelines for Research involving human subjects. Most recently amended in 2002, the goal of the guidelines is to support and help implement the ethical principles of the Helsinki Declaration "particularly in developing countries, given their socio-economic circumstances, laws and regulations and executive and administrative arrangements." The guidelines identify 26 separate items of information an investigator must provide to trial participants prior to obtaining their informed consent.

International Conference on Harmonisation 1996: GCP Guideline for GCP was developed by International Conference on Harmonisation to provide a unified standard for the European Union, Japan and United States of America to protect the rights and wellbeing of subjects involved in clinical trials and to facilitate mutual acceptance of clinical data by the regulatory authorities in these regions in the year 1996.

Informed consent in India

Clinical research in India has expanded significantly in recent years, with regulatory authorities, investigators, and Ethics Committees working to ensure ethical and high-quality clinical trials through stricter regulations and updated guidelines. Despite these advances, challenges such as illiteracy, poverty, and socioeconomic disparities continue to raise ethical concerns, particularly regarding the informed consent process. Sociocultural influences, along with diverse socioeconomic and educational backgrounds, play an important role in shaping informed consent practices among patients in India. A study by DeCosta et al. conducted in rural northern India found that many participants relied on discussions with community members before deciding whether to participate in clinical trials. This tendency was particularly evident among women, some of whom felt unable to make independent decisions. The study also highlighted a paternalistic doctor–patient relationship, where strong trust in physicians often led to limited patient involvement in medical decision-making .[26] Some studies highlighted that poor patient understanding about the consent purpose, paternalistic attitude toward doctors, and fear of asking questions were deterrents to patient participation .[27,28] Till date, there have been limited studies investigating alternative consent procedures and innovative technologies to enhance and improve patient's understanding and comprehension of the consent process with very few studies conducted on patient population in developing world. A comparative study conducted by Davis et al. of standard versus simplified

forms reported that simplifying informed consent material alone makes the forms easier and appealing to read but may not necessarily improve comprehension .[29] Studies have also shown that use of computers and multimedia in the consent process may help in improving patient's understanding and comprehension.[30] Hence, clinical research in developing countries needs to focus on enhancing informed consent guidelines keeping in perspective the diverse sociocultural environment of the country and implementing innovative strategies for conduct of informed consent process.

Table 1: Classification of Informed Consent [31,32,11]

Consent	An adult subject, capable of giving permission to participate in a research study, can provide consent. The subject must be 18 years of age and competent to make the decision to participate.
Parental consent/ permission	When children or minors are involved in research, parental or guardian permission must be obtained through a signed parental consent document. Depending on the level of risk and nature of the study, permission may be required from one parent or from both parents**.** In certain circumstances, the requirement to obtain parental permission may be waived by the Institutional Ethics Committee/IRB **i**n accordance with applicable ethical guidelines.
Assent	Assent refers to a child's voluntary agreement to participate in research. For participants aged 7–17 years, assent must be obtained in addition to parental or guardian permission. The assent document should be written in simple language appropriate to the comprehension level of the youngest participants in the age group.
Verbal consent	Verbal consent includes all the essential elements of written informed consent; however, instead of signing a document, the information is explained verbally to the participant, and the participant provides oral agreement to participate in the study.
Short Form consent	A short form consent document is typically used when there is a language barrier between the investigator and the participant. In such cases, the IRB approved consent form is orally translated into the participant's native language, and the short form serves as documentation that the required information has been communicated and understood.

Challenges in the informed consent process

Obtaining valid informed consent is an essential ethical requirement in research involving human participants; however, several challenges may affect the process. Participants may have difficulty understanding complex medical terminology, research procedures, potential risks, and benefits described in consent forms. Participants with limited literacy may also struggle to read and comprehend written consent documents .[11,33,34] According to Paul Appelbaum et al's study, research subjects systematically misrepresent the risk/benefits ratio of participating in research. They attributed this to a failure to grasp the research methods. According to this survey, 69% of participants did not comprehend the significance of randomization.[35] Although not conclusive, existing statistics indicate that research participants typically do not grasp revealed material. In a randomized study using β-blocker medicines to prolong the lives of patients with history of myocardial infarction, 44% of research participants contacted were unaware they were randomly allocated to treatment or placebo .[36,37]

Additionally, language barriers between investigators and participants may hinder effective communication, particularly in multilingual settings. Inadequate or inaccurate translation of consent information may lead to misunderstandings, and some participants may sign consent forms without fully understanding the study, which can result in withdrawal at later stages of the research**.** Another challenge involves the extent of information disclosure .[38] In some situations, extensive discussion of possible adverse effects may create unnecessary anxiety and discourage participation in potentially beneficial procedures. Furthermore, therapeutic misconception may occur when participants believe that research participation will directly benefit their personal health, confusing research with routine medical care .[39,40] Religious, cultural, and social factors may also influence decision-making. Religious beliefs may sometimes conflict with the methodology of a study, while cultural norms, family influence, or community pressure may limit an individual's ability to make an independent and voluntary decision. In busy clinical environments, time constraints may restrict the opportunity for investigators to adequately explain study details and confirm participant understanding. Obtaining informed consent is particularly challenging when research involves vulnerable populations, such as children, elderly individuals, economically disadvantaged persons, or those with limited decision-making capacity. These individuals may have difficulty understanding the purpose of research, their role in the study, and the implications of participation. Therefore, special communication strategies and additional safeguards are necessary .[41,42] When research involves children (under 18 years of age)**,** parental or guardian consent must be obtained, and child assent is required for children aged 7 years and above. Ethical challenges may arise when parents provide consent but the child refuses to assent. [43] Finally, maintaining proper documentation of the consent process and ensuring compliance with ethical and regulatory guidelines can also present practical challenges during research conduct.

Enhancing Consent: Best Practices and Innovations

Improving informed consent requires transforming it from a formal requirement into a meaningful ethical process. Simplifying consent forms by using plain language, shorter text, and clear headings can significantly improve participant understanding. Legal and ethical frameworks also support this approach. Interactive communication methods such as the teach-back technique, where participants explain information in their own words, help confirm comprehension and correct misunderstandings. In addition, digital and multimedia tools including videos, animations, and AI-assisted chatbots can improve understanding of complex research concepts, particularly in remote or online studies.

There is a well-documented gap between the current application of the informed con sent process and the ideal theoretic framework that promotes patient's autonomy and bodily integrity.[44] Many challenges arise during the consent process between a physician or investigator and the patient or study participant. Some of the most pressing challenges encountered during this process include educational barriers, changing demographics, advances in data technology.[45,46] The increase in awareness of the need to address social determinants of health and health inequity is apparent in the medical community, and approaches to informed consent should be tailored for different ethnicities and minority groups. It is thus essential to amend guidelines detailing the process of informed consent to embrace cultural diversity and prepare the new generation of physicians by developing comprehensive training programs that promote cultural intelligence. Advanced technologies and artificial intelligence systems generate vast amounts of data that can be applied across multiple contexts and purposes. While these innovations offer significant scientific and clinical benefits, they also give rise to complex ethical concerns. A particular challenge emerges in relation to biobanks that store patients' biological samples and associated health data, such as vital signs and genetic information. The data preserved in such repositories may be accessed and utilized in the future for diverse research objectives by different investigators. In these circumstances, informed consent is no longer confined to a specific study or defined time frame. This shift from case and time specific consent to broader, open-ended use can potentially undermine patients' autonomy, privacy, and personal integrity.

Informed consent should be treated as an interactive communication process, not merely a legal formality. Healthcare institutions and research studies should also include mandatory checks of participant understanding, such as the teach-back method, to confirm that individuals truly comprehend the information before consenting. Institutional Ethics Committees (IECs) should receive stronger training and resources to review not only consent documents but also the overall consent process, with periodic monitoring to ensure compliance with ethical guidelines. Finally, the responsible use of digital and multimedia consent tools should be encouraged, accompanied by safeguards for accessibility, privacy, and data protection in modern data-driven research environments.

CONCLUSION

Meaningful informed consent remains both an ethical ideal and a practical challenge in modern healthcare and biomedical research. Although permission has been firmly established as a fundamental patient right by legislative frameworks, ethical codes, and judicial precedents, empirical evidence shows ongoing deficiencies in understanding, voluntariness, and implementation. These disparities are particularly noticeable in environments with limited resources and among populations that are at risk. A multifaceted strategy including institutional responsibility, ethical education, legal enforcement, and communication-centered reforms is needed to bridge the gap between normative standards and actual practice. In the end, giving informed consent is not only required by law but also shows respect for human dignity and faith in the medical establishment. Sustainable public trust in healthcare and research, patient empowerment, and ethical integrity all depend on strengthening consent practices through systemic changes, education, and innovation.

Source of Support

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

1. Anita Jumai Ehidiamen and Olajumoke Omolayo Oladapo. Enhancing ethical standards in clinical trials: A deep dive into regulatory compliance, informed consent, and participant rights protection frameworks. World Journal of Biology Pharmacy and Health Sciences.2024;20(01):309-320.
2. Fons-Martinez J, Murciano-Gamborino C and Diez-Domingo J. Evolution of informed consent in research: From the Hippocratic Oath to the tailored consent.Open Research Europe.2024;4(72):1-16.
3. Van Nuil JI, Kestelyn E, Bull S, Nguyen PH, Le PT, Lam NB, Dang TT, Nguyen YH. Fragmented understanding: exploring the practice and meaning of informed consent in clinical trials in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.2023;24(3):2-13.
4. Del Carmen MG, Joffe S. Informed consent for medical treatment and research: a review. Oncologist.2005;10(8):636-41.
5. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Principles of biomedical ethics. New York: Oxford University Press; 2001.
6. Weijer C, Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, McRae AD, White A, Brehaut JC, et al.; Ottawa Ethics of Cluster Randomized Trials Consensus Group. The Ottawa Statement on the Ethical Design and Conduct of Cluster Randomized Trials. PLoS Med. 2012;9(11):e1001346.

7. Pietrzykowski T, Smilowska K. The reality of informed consent: empirical studies on patient comprehension—systematic review. Trials.2021;22(1):57.
8. Tam NT, Huy NT, Thoa le TB, Long NP, Trang NT, Hirayama K, Karbwang J. Participants' understanding of informed consent in clinical trials over three decades: systematic review and meta-analysis. Bull World Health Organ.2015;93(3):186-98H.
9. Lad PM, Dahl R. Audit of the informed consent process as a part of a clinical research quality assurance program. Sci Eng Ethics.2014;20(2):469-79.
10. Laurijssen SJ, van der Graaf R, van Dijk WB, Schuit E, Groenwold RH, Grobbee DE, de Vries MC. When is it impractical to ask informed consent? A systematic review. Clinical Trials.2022;19(5):545-60.
11. Nijhawan LP, Janodia MD, Muddukrishna BS, Bhat KM, Bairy KL, Udupa N, Musmade PB. Informed consent: Issues and challenges. J Adv Pharm Technol Res 2013;4:134-40.
12. Smolenski J. The foundations of informed consent and bodily self-sovereignty: a positive suggestion. Monash Bioeth Rev.2024;42(1):115-136.
13. Pietrzykowski T, Smilowska K. The reality of informed consent: empirical studies on patient comprehension-systematic review. Trials.2021;22(1):57.
14. Jefford M, Moore R. Improvement of informed consent and the quality of consent documents. Lancet Oncol.2008;9(5):485-93.
15. Anita Jumai Ehidiamen and Olajumoke Omolayo Oladapo. Enhancing ethical standards in clinical trials: A deep dive into regulatory compliance, informed consent, and participant rights protection frameworks. World Journal of Biology Pharmacy and Health Sciences.2024;20(01):309-320.
16. Cutter L. Walter Reed, Yellow Fever, and Informed Consent.Mil Med.2016;181(1):90-1.
17. Fons-Martinez J, Murciano-Gamborino C, Diez-Domingo J. Evolution of informed consent in research: From the Hippocratic Oath to the tailored consent. Open Res Eur. 2024;4:72.
18. Ortiz-Martinez JG: Consentimiento informado en cirugía ortopédica. Pers bioét.2009;13(1):59-84.
19. Altschuler EL: Informed consent in an Edgar Allen Poe tale. Lancet.2003;362(9394): 1504.
20. Suárez-Obando F, Ordoñez A: Ética de la Investigación científica: la fiebre amarilla, la Comisión Reed y el origen del consentimiento informado. Infectio.2010;14(3):206-16.
21. Vollmann J, Winau R: Informed consent in human experimentation before the Nuremberg code.BMJ.1996;313(7070):1445-9.
22. The Nuremberg code (1947). Br Med J 1996;313:1448. Available from: http://www.cirp.org/library/ethics/nuremberg/. [Last accessed on 2011 Apr 19].
23. World Medical Association declaration of Helsinki. Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. Available from: http://www.ohsr.od.nih.gov/guidelines/helsinki.html. [Last accessed on 2011 Apr 20].
24. The Belmont Report ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research. The National Commission for the protection of human subjects of biomedical and behavioral research; April 18, 1979. Available from: http://www.ohsr.od.nih. gov/guidelines/belmont.html. [Last accessed on 2011 Apr 20].
25. International ethical guidelines for biomedical research. Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS) in collaboration with the World Health Organization (WHO), Geneva, 2002. Available from: http://www.nccr.gov.my/index. cfm?menuid=23 and parentid=17. [Last accessed on 2011 Apr 20].
26. DeCosta A, D'Souza N, Krishnan S, Chhabra MS, Shihaam I, Goswami K. Community based trials and informed consent in rural North India. J Med Ethics.2004;30:318-23.
27. Bhansali S, Shafiq N, Malhotra S, Pandhi P, Singh I, Venkateshan SP, et al. Evaluation of the ability of clinical research participants to comprehend informed consent form. Contemp Clin Trials.2009;30:427-30.
28. Kumar S, Mohanraj R, Rose A, Paul MJ, Thomas G. How 'informed' is informed consent? Findings from a study in South India. Indian J Med Ethics.2012;9:180-6.1
29. Kim L, Young AJ, Neimeyer RA, Baker JN, Barfield RC. Keeping users at the center: Developing a multimedia interface for informed consent. Tech Commun Q. 2008;17:335-57.
30. Davis TC, Holcombe RF, Berkel HJ, Pramanik S, Divers SG. Informed consent for clinical trials: a comparative study of standard versus simplified forms. J Natl Cancer Inst.1998;90(9):668-74.
31. Research involving children under the age of 18. Available from: http://www.belmont.edu/irb/instructions/Consent. html#Children. [Last accessed on 2011 Apr 20].
32. CFR-Code of Federal Regulations Title 21; Part 50-Protection of Human Subjects. Short form written consent document. Available from: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfcfr/ CFRSearch.cfm?fr=50.27. [Last accessed on 2011 Apr 21]
33. Mirza, Fatima N. et al. The literacy barrier in clinical trial consents: a retrospective analysis. eClinicalMedicine.2024;75:102814.
34. Dein S, Bhui K. Issues concerning informed consent for medical research among nonwesternized ethnic minority patients in the UK. J R Soc Med.2005;98(8):354-6.
35. Appelbaum PS, Roth LH, Lidz CW, Benson P, Winslade W. False hopes and best data: onsent to research and the therapeutic misconception. Hastings Cent Rep.1987;17(2):20-4.
36. Joffe S, Cook EF, Cleary PD, Clark JW, Weeks JC. Quality of informed consent in cancer clinical trials: a cross-sectional survey. Lancet.2001;358:1772-7.
37. Smotha K,Shilpa K.Informed consent in biomedical research-Its Importance and current global guidelines-A review of literature. RGUHS Journal of Medical Sciences. 2020;10(3):123-140.
38. Schenker Y, Wang F, Selig SJ, Ng R, Fernandez A. The impact of language barriers on documentation of informed consent at a hospital with on-site interpreter services. J Gen Intern Med.2007;22(2):294-9.

39. Hon YK, Narayanan P, Goh PP. Extended discussion of information for informed consent for participation in clinical trials. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;2012(5):CD009835.

40. Jehovah's Witnesses and Blood Transfusions. Available from: http://www.jwfacts.com/watchtower/blood-transfusions. php. [Last accessed on 2011 May 2]

41. Ethical Principles for Researching Vulnerable Groups 2003 May. Available from: http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/ethicalprinciples. pdf. [Last accessed on 2011 May 7].

42. Gordon BG. Vulnerability in Research: Basic Ethical Concepts and General Approach to Review. Ochsner J. 2020;20(1):34-38.

43. Marsh V, Mwangome N, Jao I, Wright K, Molyneux S, Davies A. Who should decide about children's and adolescents' participation in health research? The views of children and adults in rural Kenya. BMC Med Ethics.2019;20(1):41.

44. Grady Christine. Enduring and emerging challenges of informed consent. N Engl J Med.2015;372(9):855–62.2

45. Raich PC, Plomer KD, Coyne CA. Literacy, Comprehension, and Informed Con sent in. Clin Res.2001;19(4):437-45.

46. Larson E, Foe G, Lally R. Reading Level and Length of Written Research Consent Forms. Clin Translational Sci.2015;8(4):355–6.