International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 3411-3418
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Nursing Practices in Managing Patients Who Refuse Treatment

Hashash Husein M. Al-Degmi[1]*, Amirah Saad Shawman Alruwaili[2], Ibtisam Zughayr Ayyat Alrawili[3], Yousef Srad Odinan Alanazi[4], Furjah Hulayyil A Alanazi[5], Wadi Hussaini Ayash Alenezi[6], Fadhah Abdullah Albalawi[7], Najla Rwaished K Alenezi[8], Alruwaili Harbiyah Alrawdhi M[9], Waad Saud Mohammed Alenzi[10], Hana Basheer Ahmed Almayhubi[11]

[1]Technician Nursing – Maternity and Children's Hospital, Sakaka – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Sakaka – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** haldegme@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0040-9950

[2]Technician Nursing – King Fahd District Primary Health Care Center, Dumat Al Jandal – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Dumat Al Jandal – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: aalrwyly008@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-1041-9950

[3]Nursing Specialist – Turaif General Hospital – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Turaif – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: ealrowaili@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-2042-9950

[4]Technician Nursing – Maternity and Children's Hospital, Arar – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: yosalanazi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-3043-9950

[5]Technician Nursing – Turaif General Hospital – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Turaif – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: fualanazi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-4044-9950

[6]Technician Nursing – Forensic Medical Services Center – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: whalenezi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5045-9950

[7]Technician Nursing – Eradah Mental Health Complex – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tabuk – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Faalblawi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-6046-9950

[8]Nursing Specialist – Eradah Complex and Mental Health – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Najlaalenezi@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-7048-9950

[9]Nursing Specialist – Al Zahour Primary Health Care Center, Sakaka – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Sakaka – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: harbiaha@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-8049-9950

[10]Technician Nursing – Prince Abdulaziz bin Musaed Hospital – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: waalenzi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-9022-9950

[11]Technician Nursing – Abu Rakah Primary Health Care Center – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Abu Rakah – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: halmaihobi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-1111-9950

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4634
Received : 01 July 2024
Accepted : 30 July 2024

Keywords

Nursing practices,
patient autonomy,
treatment refusal,
communication skills,
active listening,
motivational interviewing

Abstract:

Nursing practices in managing patients who refuse treatment are essential for ensuring that patient autonomy is respected while simultaneously promoting their health and safety. Effective communication skills are critical when addressing treatment refusal, as nurses must engage empathetically with patients to understand their concerns and motivations. Active listening and motivational interviewing can aid in uncovering the underlying reasons for refusal, such as fear, misinformation, or previous negative experiences. This understanding allows nurses to provide tailored education, minimize anxiety, and support informed decision-making. Additionally, fostering a therapeutic relationship can help build trust, enabling patients to feel more comfortable expressing their concerns and reconsidering their choices. Moreover, ethical considerations play a crucial role in the management of patients who refuse treatment. Nurses must balance their professional responsibility to provide care with respect for patient autonomy, adhering to ethical principles such as beneficence and non-maleficence. Documentation is essential in these situations, as it helps track the patient's decision-making process and the provided information. Nurses should also be equipped with knowledge of relevant laws and institutional policies regarding treatment refusal, ensuring that they advocate for the patient's best interests while adhering to legal standards. Collaborative approaches involving interdisciplinary teams can further benefit patients, as they allow for comprehensive discussions regarding treatment options, ultimately guiding patients toward making informed choices that align with their values and preferences.

1. Introduction

The evolution of modern healthcare ethics has witnessed a paradigmatic shift from a paternalistic model, where the physician's beneficent authority was paramount, to a patient-centered framework that enshrines the principle of individual self-determination as its cornerstone. This foundational principle, patient autonomy, affirms the inviolable right of a competent individual to exercise control over their own body and life trajectory by making informed, voluntary decisions regarding medical interventions [1]. At its most profound and challenging application, this right encompasses the liberty to decline any recommended treatment, even when that refusal may foreseeably lead to disability, deterioration, or death. The legal and ethical recognition of this right, however, does not render its execution in clinical practice simple or straightforward. Instead, it introduces one of the most complex, emotionally charged, and recurrent dilemmas within the healthcare environment, demanding a delicate balance between honoring a patient's wishes and upholding the professional imperative to provide care that promotes well-being and prevents harm. This tension resides not in the abstract realms of philosophy or law, but at the very bedside, in the daily interactions that define patient care. It is here, in this critical space, that the nursing profession finds itself consistently and intimately engaged.

Nurses, by virtue of their unique professional positioning, are invariably at the epicenter of episodes of treatment refusal. Their role extends far beyond the technical execution of medical orders; they are constant caregivers, vigilant assessors, skilled communicators, and primary patient advocates. Unlike other members of the healthcare team whose interactions may be episodic, nurses sustain a continuous therapeutic presence, often building a relationship of trust that is fundamental to understanding the patient's perspective. This proximity places them in the direct line of fire when a patient voices dissent, uttering the potent phrase, "I do not consent." Consequently, nurses are tasked with the initial and often ongoing management of these situations, serving as essential mediators between the patient's personal values and the clinical objectives of the treating team, as well as the concerns of anxious family members [2]. They operate at the intersection of competing values, where the ethical principle of autonomy collides with the principles of beneficence (doing good) and non-maleficence (avoiding harm), all while navigating the intricate web of legal statutes and institutional policies that govern consent and capacity.

The management of treatment refusal is profoundly misconceived if viewed as a mere administrative hurdle or a simple binary event—a signature withheld on a consent form. In reality, it constitutes a complex, dynamic, and psychologically nuanced process that unfolds over time. It demands of the nurse a sophisticated and multifaceted synthesis of competencies. First and foremost, it requires keen ethical reasoning to identify the core values in conflict and to navigate the path that best respects the patient as a moral agent. Concurrently, a firm grasp of legal precedents and statutory requirements is non-negotiable, as the consequences of mismanagement can be severe for both patient and practitioner [3]. This legal-ethical

foundation must then be activated through expert therapeutic communication; the ability to engage in open, non-judgmental dialogue to explore the roots of refusal, provide clear information, and build a collaborative alliance is perhaps the most critical skill in this domain [4]. Underpinning all of this is meticulous clinical judgment, particularly in assessing the patient's decision-making capacity—a clinical determination that is decision-specific and can fluctuate, requiring careful evaluation to ensure the refusal is truly an expression of a capable, informed will [5].

The ramifications of a patient's decision to refuse treatment ripple outward, creating a cascade of effects that extend far beyond the immediate clinical implications for their physiological health. The most immediate impact is often on the therapeutic nurse-patient relationship itself. A refusal can be perceived by a nurse, however unintentionally, as a rejection of their care and expertise, potentially creating frustration or a sense of failure. For the patient, how the refusal is handled can either reinforce their autonomy and strengthen trust or, if met with coercion or disapproval, can lead to feelings of alienation, defiance, or a complete breakdown in communication [6]. Furthermore, these situations are a primary source of moral distress for nurses and other caregivers. Moral distress arises when an individual knows the ethically appropriate course of action but feels constrained from taking it due to institutional, procedural, or interpersonal barriers [7]. A nurse may deeply believe in respecting a patient's refusal of a blood transfusion on religious grounds, yet simultaneously experience profound anguish witnessing the patient's decline, feeling powerless to alter the outcome. This internal conflict, if unaddressed, contributes to burnout, compassion fatigue, and staff turnover, eroding the resilience of the healthcare workforce.

The complexity multiplies within the interdisciplinary team. A patient's refusal can become a focal point for conflict among healthcare providers who may hold differing views on the patient's capacity, the acceptability of the risk, or the ethical priorities of the case. The nurse, as the consistent bedside observer, may find themselves advocating for the patient's expressed wishes to a medical team focused on physiological repair, or conversely, communicating the medical team's grave concerns to a patient who remains unmoved. Without clear protocols and a shared ethical understanding, such scenarios can lead to fragmented care, inter-professional tension, and a compromised care environment for all involved [8].

2. Ethical and Legal Foundations of Treatment Refusal

The nursing response to treatment refusal is deeply rooted in a clear understanding of both ethical principles and legal statutes. Autonomy, the ethical principle of self-determination, is the primary driver behind the right to refuse. Respect for autonomy obligates healthcare providers to acknowledge a patient's right to hold views, make choices, and take actions based on personal values and beliefs, free from coercion [1]. This principle is operationalized through the process of informed consent, which requires that a patient's agreement to treatment is predicated on a full understanding of the nature of the procedure, its potential benefits, material risks, reasonable alternatives, and the consequences of non-treatment [2]. A refusal of treatment is, in essence, an exercise of this same autonomous choice. Closely linked are the principles of beneficence (acting for the patient's good) and non-maleficence (avoiding harm). These principles can create tension, as a nurse's desire to promote health and prevent suffering may conflict with the patient's autonomous choice to forgo a beneficial intervention [3]. The ethical principle of justice, concerning fairness in resource distribution and care delivery, may also be considered, though it is secondary to autonomy in this context.

Legally, the right to refuse treatment is well-established in common law, constitutional law, and statutory provisions. For competent adult patients, this right is nearly absolute. Competence, or decision-making capacity, is a clinical determination central to this legality. A patient is presumed competent unless adjudicated otherwise, and competence is decision-specific; a patient may lack capacity for a complex surgical decision but retain capacity to refuse a routine blood draw [4]. Key legal cases have cemented this right. For instance, the precedent set in *Schloendorff v. Society of New York Hospital* established that every human being of adult years and sound mind has the right to determine what shall be done with his own body [5]. Furthermore, legislation such as the Patient Self-Determination Act (PSDA) in the United States mandates that healthcare institutions inform patients of their rights to accept or refuse treatment and to formulate advance directives [6]. For patients who are deemed to lack decision-making capacity, legal mechanisms such as advance directives, healthcare proxies, or surrogate decision-makers guided by substituted judgment or best interest standards come into effect. Nurses must be thoroughly versed in their institution's policies and local laws regarding capacity assessments, emergency treatment provisions

(which may override refusal in specific, immediate life-threatening situations where the patient's wishes are unknown), and the use of restraints, which are governed by extremely stringent regulations [7].

3. Comprehensive Nursing Assessment and Documentation

When a patient refuses treatment, the nurse's first responsibility shifts from task completion to a deliberate and thorough assessment process. This assessment is multi-layered, aiming to uncover the root cause of the refusal, evaluate the patient's decision-making capacity, and identify any modifiable factors. The initial step is to engage in immediate, non-judgmental dialogue to understand the patient's rationale. Refusals can stem from a wide array of causes: fear or misunderstanding of the treatment (e.g., pain from injections, side effects of chemotherapy), cultural or religious beliefs (e.g., Jehovah's Witnesses refusing blood transfusions), psychological states such as depression or anxiety, feelings of loss of control, distrust of the healthcare system, or experiences of past trauma [8, 9]. A patient in severe pain may refuse ambulation, not out of non-compliance, but due to unmanaged symptoms. A patient with delirium may refuse medications because they are experiencing paranoia. Distinguishing between a reasoned choice based on personal values and a choice driven by a reversible medical or psychological condition is a critical nursing function.

Concurrently, the nurse must perform a clinical assessment of the patient's decision-making capacity. While a formal evaluation may be conducted by a physician or psychiatrist, nurses are often the first to identify signs of incapacity. A practical framework assesses the patient's ability to: 1) *Understand* relevant information about the treatment and its consequences, 2) *Appreciate* the situation and its likely outcomes for themselves, 3) *Reason* through the alternatives by comparing options and consequences, and 4) *Communicate* a clear and consistent choice [10]. The nurse should document the patient's responses verbatim when possible. For example, documenting "Patient stated, 'I know the doctor said this antibiotic will help my pneumonia, but I'm afraid it will kill the good bacteria in my gut and make me sicker like last time,'" demonstrates a level of understanding and reasoning, whereas "Patient shouted, 'Get away with your poison!' without engaging in conversation" suggests a different clinical picture.

Documentation of a treatment refusal is a legal and professional imperative and must be meticulous. The entry should be objective, factual, and detailed, avoiding subjective judgments like "patient was uncooperative." Essential elements include: the specific treatment refused; the time, date, and location; the exact words used by the patient; the information provided to the patient (including re-education efforts); an assessment of the patient's apparent capacity and emotional state; the identified reason for refusal, if given; the notified members of the healthcare team (physician, charge nurse, etc.); and the explained consequences of refusal as understood by the patient [11, 12]. This comprehensive documentation serves to protect the patient's rights, provides a legal record of the event, ensures continuity of care by informing all team members, and forms the basis for ongoing intervention planning.

4. Therapeutic Communication and Negotiation Strategies

Effective communication is the most powerful tool in the nurse's arsenal for managing treatment refusal. The goal is not to coerce or persuade the patient into submission, but to engage in a therapeutic partnership that fosters understanding, addresses concerns, and explores alternatives while respecting the final decision. The approach must be patient-centered, empathetic, and collaborative. Core communication strategies are essential. Firstly, nurses should employ active listening, giving the patient their full attention, using open-ended questions, and reflecting back what they hear to ensure accurate understanding [13]. Statements like, "It sounds like you're very worried about the side effects of this medication," validate the patient's feelings and open the door for further discussion.

A critical step is to ensure the refusal is truly informed. It cannot be assumed the initial explanation was fully understood. The nurse should provide clear, concise re-education using non-technical language, utilizing teach-back methods where the patient explains the information back in their own words [14]. Visual aids or written materials can be helpful. Exploring the patient's concerns in depth is crucial. If a patient refuses a diagnostic test due to fear of pain, the nurse can discuss pain management options beforehand. If a treatment conflicts with cultural practices, the nurse, in collaboration with the team, can seek to find a culturally congruent alternative or involve a community leader or family member in discussions, with the patient's permission [15].

Negotiation and compromise are often fruitful paths. This involves shifting from a stance of "you must do this" to "what can we do together?" The nurse can explore alternatives that may be

acceptable to the patient while still addressing the clinical need. For example, if a patient refuses oral medication due to nausea, alternatives might include a different formulation (liquid, dissolvable), administration with specific food, an anti-emetic first, or exploring if a parenteral route is an option and if the patient would consent to that [16]. The focus is on shared decision-making, where the patient retains control over their body but is actively engaged in problem-solving with the healthcare team. Setting boundaries with empathy is also key; while respecting the refusal, the nurse can explain ongoing care obligations, such as continued monitoring of vital signs or symptoms, to ensure the patient does not feel abandoned [17].

5. Interdisciplinary Collaboration and Escalation Protocols

No nurse manages treatment refusal in isolation. It is an inherently interdisciplinary challenge requiring seamless collaboration and clear communication channels. The nurse's role as the coordinator and communicator is pivotal. The primary physician or treating clinician must be notified promptly of any refusal, as it may necessitate a change in the medical management plan. The nurse provides the physician with the detailed assessment, including the patient's rationale and capacity observations, which informs the physician's own evaluation and discussion with the patient [18]. Collaboration with social workers is invaluable, particularly when refusals are linked to psychosocial complexities such as homelessness, substance withdrawal, mental health crises, or intricate family dynamics. Social workers can connect patients with community resources, provide counseling, and facilitate family meetings [19].

In cases involving potential ethical dilemmas or conflicts—such as when the team believes a patient with questionable capacity is making a grave decision, or when family members strongly disagree with the patient's choice—the activation of formal support structures is necessary. Most institutions have an ethics consultation service. An ethics consult provides a structured, neutral forum to analyze the ethical dimensions of the case, clarify values, and recommend a course of action that respects ethical principles and institutional policy, often helping to resolve conflicts [20]. The nurse is frequently the one to identify the need for such a consult and initiate the process through the appropriate chain of command. Furthermore, involving hospital legal counsel may be required in complex situations, especially those involving guardianship issues or when there is uncertainty about the legality of overriding a refusal in an emergency. Adherence to established institutional escalation protocols is non-negotiable. These protocols define clear steps for notification, documentation, and chain of command involvement, ensuring a consistent, legally defensible, and patient-safe response across all departments [21].

6. Special Considerations in High-Risk Scenarios

Certain contexts of treatment refusal present heightened risks and require specialized nursing approaches. Refusals in emergency and acute care settings are particularly volatile. In a true emergency where a patient is unconscious, delirious, or otherwise incapacitated and their wishes are unknown, the principle of implied consent allows for the provision of life-saving treatment [22]. However, if a conscious, alert patient with apparent capacity refuses emergency care (e.g., refusing amputation for a gangrenous limb), the team must honor that refusal after ensuring understanding, even if the consequences are dire. The management of the suicidal patient who refuses treatment poses a distinct challenge. Here, the ethical tension between autonomy and beneficence (in the form of paternalism) is acute. Most jurisdictions have mental health statutes that permit involuntary assessment and, if criteria are met, involuntary treatment for individuals who pose a serious danger to themselves due to mental illness [23]. Nurses must be knowledgeable about these laws, which often require specific documentation of dangerousness and the involvement of designated mental health professionals.

Patients with fluctuating or impaired capacity, such as those with advanced dementia, delirium, or certain psychiatric conditions, represent another complex group. Nursing assessment must be ongoing, as capacity can vary. For patients with advance directives, those documents must guide care. In their absence, surrogate decision-makers must be engaged. Nurses play a key role in educating surrogates about the patient's clinical status and the principles of substituted judgment, helping them to make decisions the patient would have made, not necessarily what the surrogate would choose [24]. End-of-life care refusals, such as the decision to forego resuscitation (DNR), cease life-sustaining treatments like dialysis or ventilatory support, or voluntarily stop eating and drinking (VSED), require exceptional sensitivity and support. The nurse's role transitions from curative intervention to ensuring comfort, providing emotional and spiritual support, facilitating meaningful goodbyes, and upholding the patient's

dignified death in accordance with their wishes [25, 26]. This includes aggressive palliative symptom management and unwavering presence.

7. Nurse Self-Care, Moral Distress, and Professional Boundaries

The cumulative effect of managing repeated treatment refusals, especially those with tragic outcomes, can take a significant toll on the nurse's psychological and emotional well-being, leading to moral distress. Moral distress occurs when a nurse knows the ethically appropriate action to take but feels constrained from taking it due to institutional, procedural, or interpersonal barriers [27]. Examples include feeling forced to repeatedly attempt to persuade a frail, terminally ill patient to accept another invasive procedure they do not want, or witnessing a patient suffer because they refused a treatment based on a misunderstanding the nurse feels could have been clarified. Unaddressed moral distress leads to burnout, compassion fatigue, and staff turnover [28].

Therefore, proactive strategies for nurse self-care and systemic support are critical components of professional practice. On an individual level, nurses must develop reflexivity to recognize the signs of moral distress in themselves. Institutions should provide structured debriefing sessions following difficult cases, offering a safe space for staff to process emotions without judgment [29]. Access to ethics committees or clinical ethicists for staff support, not just case consultation, is beneficial. Furthermore, clear professional boundaries are essential. The nurse must differentiate between respecting patient autonomy and feeling responsible for the outcome of the patient's choice. The nurse's professional duty is to ensure the decision is informed, voluntary, and respected—not to guarantee the patient makes the choice the nurse believes is "correct." Counseling and employee assistance programs should be readily available and destigmatized [30]. Fostering a unit culture that acknowledges the difficulty of these situations and supports open discussion is a leadership imperative.

8. Education, Training, and Recommendations for Enhanced Practice

To navigate the complexities of treatment refusal competently and confidently, nurses require targeted education and training that extends beyond foundational ethics courses. Pre-licensure nursing curricula must integrate robust, scenario-based learning on assessment of decision-making capacity, therapeutic communication techniques for difficult conversations, legal aspects of consent and refusal, and detailed documentation practices [31, 32]. Simulation labs using standardized patients can provide a safe environment for students to practice these skills, receiving feedback on both their technical communication and their nonverbal, empathetic demeanor [33].

For practicing nurses, ongoing professional development is crucial. Hospitals should mandate regular in-service trainings that address unit-specific challenges, such as managing refusal of vital medications on a psychiatric ward or blood products in a surgical unit. Training should also cover implicit bias, as a nurse's own values and biases can unconsciously influence interactions with patients who refuse care, particularly across differences in culture, religion, or lifestyle [34]. Interprofessional education (IPE) activities that bring nurses, physicians, social workers, and ethicists together to discuss complex cases can break down silos and build a shared understanding of roles and protocols [35].

System-level recommendations are necessary to empower nursing practice. Institutions should develop and widely disseminate clear, accessible policies and procedures for managing treatment refusal, including checklists for assessment, documentation templates, and explicit escalation pathways [36]. The integration of structured communication tools, such as the Situation-Background-Assessment-Recommendation (SBAR) format, into electronic health records can standardize and improve interdisciplinary communication during these events [37]. Furthermore, healthcare organizations must actively invest in creating supportive environments that recognize the emotional labor involved. This includes providing adequate staffing levels to allow nurses the time required for these often lengthy conversations, establishing formal peer-support programs, and ensuring leadership is accessible and responsive to frontline concerns about ethical practice [38].

9. Conclusion

The management of patients who refuse treatment stands as a defining challenge in nursing, testing the profession's commitment to its dual mandate of promoting patient well-being and respecting patient self-determination. It is a practice domain that rejects simplistic solutions and demands a nuanced, principled, and compassionate approach. As developed throughout this analysis, effective nursing practice in this arena is built upon a solid foundation of ethical and legal knowledge, executed through a meticulous process of assessment and documentation, and advanced by

masterful therapeutic communication and interdisciplinary collaboration. Special populations and high-risk scenarios require tailored understanding and sensitivity, while the well-being of the nurse, threatened by moral distress, must be safeguarded through self-care and systemic support. Ultimately, the goal is not to eliminate treatment refusal—an impossibility in a system valuing autonomy—but to ensure that every refusal is handled with such professionalism, empathy, and rigor that it strengthens, rather than undermines, the therapeutic alliance. By investing in comprehensive education, clear protocols, and a supportive culture, healthcare systems can empower nurses to transform these difficult moments from sources of conflict into opportunities for deepening trust, honoring personal dignity, and providing care that is truly aligned with the patient's values and wishes, even in the face of disagreement. The competent, compassionate management of treatment refusal is, therefore, not merely a clinical task, but a profound expression of the highest ideals of the nursing profession.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Lekas H.-M., Alfandre D., Gordon P., Harwood K., Yin M.T. The role of patient-provider interactions: Using an accounts framework to explain hospital discharges against medical advice. Soc. Sci. Med. 2016;156:106–113. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.03.018.
2. Cooper S. Taking no for an answer-refusal of life-sustaining treatment. Virtual Mentor. 2010;12:444–449. DOI: 10.1001/virtualmentor.2010.12.6.ccas2-1006.
3. Lee C.A., Cho J.P., Choi S.C., Kim H.H., Park J.O. Patients who leave the emergency department against medical advice. Clin. Exp. Emerg. Med. 2016;3:88–94. DOI: 10.15441/ceem.15.015.
4. Erbay H., Alan S., Kadioglu S. Attitudes of prehospital emergency care professionals toward refusal to undergo treatment: A regional survey in Turkey. Nurs. Ethics. 2014;21:530–539. DOI: 10.1177/0969733013505311.
5. Oyemolade T.A., Adeleye A.O., Ogunyileka O.C., Arogundade F.M., Olusola A.J., Aribisala O.O. Determinants of discharge against medical advice from a rural neurosurgical service in a developing country: A prospective observational study. Surg. Neurol. Int. 2020;11:290. DOI: 10.25259/SNI_559_2020.
6. Onukwugha E., Saunders E., Mullins C.D., Pradel F.G., Zuckerman M., Weir M.R. Reasons for discharges against medical advice: A qualitative study. Qual. Saf. Health Care. 2010;19:420–424. DOI: 10.1136/qshc.2009.036269.
7. Al-Wathinani A.M., Barten D.G., Alsahli H., Alhamid A., Alghamdi W., Alqahtani W., Alghamdi R., Aljuaid M., Albaqami N.A., Goniewicz K. The Right to Refuse: Understanding Healthcare Providers' Perspectives on Patient Autonomy in Emergency Care. Healthcare. 2023;11:1756. DOI: 10.3390/healthcare11121756.
8. Fumis R.R.L., Junqueira Amarante G.A., de Fátima Nascimento A., Vieira J.M., Jr. Moral distress and its contribution to the development of burnout syndrome among critical care providers. Ann. Intensive Care. 2017;7:71. DOI: 10.1186/s13613-017-0293-2.
9. Chang N.T., Chang Y.H., Huang Y.T., Chen S.C. Factors Associated with Refusal or Discontinuation of Treatment in Patients with Bladder Cancer: A Cohort Population-Based Study in Taiwan. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health. 2021;18:618. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph18020618.
10. Republic of Lithuania, Ministry of Health Order No. V-587 of 17 May 2019 on the Approval of the Procedure for Monitoring Cases of Involuntary Hospitalization and Involuntary Treatment of Patients with Mental and Behavioural Disorders. Register of Legal Acts (TAR), 21 May 2019; No. 2019-08025.
11. Civil Code of the Republic of Lithuania No. VIII-1864, Adopted 18 July 2000, Entered into Force 1 July 2001. 2000, No. 74-2262.
12. Law on the Practice of Medicine of the Republic of Lithuania No. I-1555, Adopted 25 September 1996, Entered into Force 1 July 1997. 1996, No. 102-2313.
13. Republic of Lithuania Law on the Amendment of the Law on the Rights of Patients and Compensation for the Damage to Their Health, Article 8. 24 July 2004; No. 115.
14. Hamric A.B., Epstein E.G. A Health System-wide Moral Distress Consultation Service: Development

and Evaluation. HEC Forum. 2017;29:127–143. DOI: 10.1007/s10730-016-9315-y.
15. Lithuania: Country Health Profile 2021.
16. Epstein E.G., Whitehead P.B., Prompahakul C., Thacker L.R., Hamric A.B. Enhancing Understanding of Moral Distress: The Measure of Moral Distress for Health Care Professionals. AJOB Empir. Bioeth. 2019;10:113–124. DOI: 10.1080/23294515.2019.1586008.
17. STROBE STROBE.
18. Kasuga H., Endo S., Masuishi Y., Hidaka T., Kakamu T., Saito K., Abe K., Fukushima T. Association between subjective economic status and refusal of life-prolonging treatment: A cross-sectional study using content analysis with stratified random sampling. Fukushima J. Med. Sci. 2022;68:11–18. DOI: 10.5387/fms.2021-13.
19. Baumhäkel M., Müller U., Böhm M. Influence of gender of physicians and patients on guideline-recommended treatment of chronic heart failure in a cross-sectional study. Eur. J. Heart Fail. 2009;11:299–303. DOI: 10.1093/eurjhf/hfn041.
20. Dahrouge S., Seale E., Hogg W., Russell G., Younger J., Muggah E., Ponka D., Mercer J. A Comprehensive Assessment of Family Physician Gender and Quality of Care: A Cross-Sectional Analysis in Ontario, Canada. Med. Care. 2016;54:277–286. DOI: 10.1097/MLR.0000000000000480.
21. Mansell R., Purssell E. Treatment abandonment in children with cancer in Sub-Saharan Africa: Systematic literature review and meta-analysis. J. Adv. Nurs. 2018;74:800–808. DOI: 10.1111/jan.13476.
22. Republic of Lithuania Criminal Code, Articles 140, 294, 2000 Oct 25; No. 89-2741.
23. Corley M.C. Nurse moral distress: A proposed theory and research agenda. Nurs. Ethics. 2002;9:636–650. DOI: 10.1191/0969733002ne557oa.
24. Zhu H., Wu L.T. Discharge against medical advice from hospitalizations for substance use disorders: The potential impact of the Affordable Care Act. Drug Alcohol. Depend. 2019;197:115–119. DOI: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.12.032.
25. Sadler K., Alwali M., Nancarrow L., Albalawi M., Khan S., Alyami H.H. Discharge against medical advice in pediatrics: A review and recommendation of a five-component approach. Int. J. Pediatr. Adolesc. Med. 2023;10:51–58. DOI: 10.4103/ijpam.ijpam_8_24.
26. Connelly J.E., Campbell C. Patients who refuse treatment in medical offices. Arch. Intern. Med. 1987;147:1829–1833. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.1987.00370100143024.
27. Abuzeyad F.H., Farooq M., Alam S.F., Ibrahim M.I., Bashmi L., Aljawder S.S., Ellouze N., Almusalam A., Hsu S., Das P. Discharge against medical advice from the emergency department in a university hospital. BMC Emerg. Med. 2021;21:31. DOI: 10.1186/s12873-021-00422-6.
28. Ashrafi E., Nobakht S., Keykaleh M.S., Kakemam E., Hasanpoor E., Sokhanvar M. Discharge against medical advice (DAMA): Causes and predictors. Electron. Physician. 2017;9:4563–4570. DOI: 10.19082/4563.
29. Brzezinski M., Gregersen M., Schuch L.G., Sawatzki R., Chen J.W., Gauger G., Kukreja J., Cason B. Discharge against Medical Advice in Surgical Patients with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: A Case Report Series Illustrating Unique Challenges. Case Rep. Anesthesiol. 2017;2017:3045907. DOI: 10.1155/2017/3045907.
30. Stern T.W., Silverman B.C., Smith F.A., Stern T.A. Prior discharges against medical advice and withdrawal of consent: What they can teach us about patient management. Prim. Care Companion CNS Disord. 2011;13 DOI: 10.4088/PCC.10f01047blu.
31. Dalrymple A.J., Fata M. Cross-validating factors associated with discharges against medical advice. Can. J. Psychiatry. 1993;38:285–289. DOI: 10.1177/070674379303800411.
32. Berger J.T. Discharge against medical advice: Ethical considerations and professional obligations. J. Hosp. Med. 2008;3:403–408. DOI: 10.1002/jhm.362.
33. Machin L.L., Goodwin D., Warriner D. An Alternative View of Self-Discharge Against Medical Advice: An Opportunity to Demonstrate Empathy, Empowerment, and Care. Qual. Health Res. 2018;28:702–710. DOI: 10.1177/1049732318754514.
34. Onukwugha E., Alfandre D. Against Medical Advice Discharges Are Increasing for Targeted Conditions of the Medicare Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program. J. Gen. Intern. Med. 2019;34:515–517. DOI: 10.1007/s11606-018-4765-3.
35. Erbay H., Alan S., Kadıoğlu S. A case study from the perspective of medical ethics: Refusal to undergo treatment in an ambulance. J. Med. Ethics. 2010;36:652–655. DOI: 10.1136/jme.2010.035600.
36. Lees L., Dyer P. Why patients self-discharge. Nurs. Manag. 2008;15:22–27. DOI: 10.7748/nm2008.05.15.2.22.c8216.
37. Saia M., Buja A., Fusinato R., Fonzo M., Bertoncello C., Baldo V. Uncompleted Emergency Department Care (UEDC): A 5-year population-based study in the Veneto Region, Italy. J. Prev. Med. Hyg. 2019;60:E18–E24. DOI: 10.15167/2421-4248/jpmh2019.60.1.1062.
38. Holmes E.G., Cooley B.S., Fleisch S.B., Rosenstein D.L. Against Medical Advice Discharge: A Narrative Review and Recommendations for a Systematic Approach. Am. J. Med. 2021;134:721–726. DOI: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2020.12.027.