

## INTRODUCTION

We present the second issue of 2025 with a variety of topics that strengthen reflection and open up dialogue on highly relevant issues such as ethical research on human beings, the environmental question and its repercussions on the life and health of populations, palliative care and some new developments in the rethinking of contraception and personalist bioethics and its current relevance. The topics published here represent philosophical analyses that are pertinent to addressing the bioethical challenges of our time. This issue is thus made up of six interesting articles and two reviews.

The first article by Dr. Carlos Rodas examines unethical research practices with indigenous communities, highlighting the lack of informed consent, the absence of community consultation and cultural insensitivity. The article introduces the concept of the “Triangle of Decay”, which describes the factors that facilitate ethical dumping: abuse of power, ignorance of ethical standards, economic interests and the complicity of silence of third parties that affect good research practices. These factors are known as “ethical dumping” and refer to mechanisms where the strict ethical standards of research involving human subjects are omitted or their review is relaxed due to the existence of any or all of the three factors mentioned.

Therefore, the article emphasizes the need to strengthen research ethics, with measures such as the promotion of local ethics committees, community participation in studies and the application of principles such as reconciliation and respect for indigenous knowledge, urging a change of mentality in this field.

The second article by Dr. Vázquez analyzes the interconnection between the environment and the health of individuals and communities, as it addresses the relationship between water poverty and sustainable development in Mexico, highlighting the need to guarantee access to drinking water and sanitation as a key factor in reducing

poverty in the country. It is mentioned that Mexico faces both extreme and moderate poverty, with a worrying rating in terms of water availability and management. In addition, the country has a high ecological footprint and is struggling to meet the commitments of the UN's 2030 Agenda, due to a combination of ineffective policies, environmental pollution and the impact of globalization on water resource distribution.

The study emphasizes the importance of implementing rapid measures to guarantee sustainable development, including environmental education, investment in renewable energies and compliance with international agreements. To this end, the author recommends greater international cooperation and the implementation of policies that balance economic growth with the conservation of natural resources.

The third article presented by Dr. Gavlik rethinks the current state of ontologically grounded personalist bioethics, comparing its influence with the original proposal of Elio Sgreccia. The author claims that the former is based on a realistic and metaphysical anthropology that places the human person at the center of ethical reflection. However, a quantitative analysis of academic publications between 2015 and 2020 reveals that many of the research studies catalogued as personalist do not strictly comply with this fundamental criterion, which can generate confusion about their impact on the defense of human dignity.

Through the study of 340 publications, only 7% met the strict criteria of this theory. Many studies were found to omit essential elements such as anthropological foundation, the triangular methodology (integration of science, anthropology and ethics) or the argumentation proper to the aforementioned model. Additionally, the author concludes that some findings suggest the erroneous association of personalist bioethics with theological or principlist bioethics approaches.

Likewise, and based on his findings, the author emphasizes the need for greater precision in its teaching, development and research

through publications that faithfully follow its methodology and argumentation.

Meanwhile, the article by doctors Vázquez, Templos and García revisits the debate on the current situation of palliative care through research that analyzes the clinical characteristics and palliative needs of patients with non-oncological liver failure at the Dr. Manuel Gea González General Hospital.

One of the assumptions on which the study is based is the fact that liver failure is one of the main causes of death in Mexico and given the low number of liver transplants in the country, early palliative care becomes essential. Through an observational and retrospective study of 80 patients between 2021 and 2023, it was determined that 100% of the cases required palliative care, with alcoholism as the main etiology (73.75%). In addition, 80% met the criteria for advanced chronic disease according to the NECPAL scale, confirming the need for timely palliative interventions. Of the sample, 73.75% were men.

The main clinical complications identified were refractory hepatic encephalopathy (40%), recurrent bleeding from esophageal varices (30%) and refractory ascites (22.5%). These data, the authors affirm, reinforce the importance of integrating palliative care from the early stages of the disease to improve the quality of life of patients and their families, reduce unnecessary hospitalizations and optimize the use of medical resources.

In conclusion, the study provides sufficient data to justify the implementation of an early palliative care program for patients with advanced liver failure which, in addition to improving the quality of life and well-being of patients and their families, reduces the economic and social impact of the disease on the Mexican health system.

We continue with the next article by Dr. Badr, who proposes a new classification of contraceptive methods from a global bioethics approach, highlighting the inconsistencies in the current division between “modern” and “traditional” methods used by organizations

such as the UN and the WHO. The author argues that this classification lacks clarity in terms of criteria of effectiveness, safety, environmental impact and gender equity.

The analysis reveals that many modern contraceptive methods, such as hormonal pills and intrauterine devices, have significant side effects, health risks and an adverse ecological impact. In addition, discrepancies in the effectiveness of different methods are identified, demonstrating that some natural methods based on the observation of the menstrual cycle can be as effective as artificial methods if used correctly. In this sense, an alternative classification is proposed that distinguishes between popular methods (non-scientific and non-invasive), artificial interfering methods (scientific and invasive) and physiological methods (scientific and non-invasive), prioritizing the latter for their alignment with sustainable development and gender equity.

This new classification seeks to integrate bioethical, scientific and environmental considerations into the choice of contraceptive methods, promoting options that minimize health risks and reduce ecological impact.

On the other hand, the sixth article presented in this issue by doctors Tipán, Freire and Novoa presents an important finding regarding the attitude of doctors towards drug advertising.

The authors start from the fact that medical students establish premature links with drug advertising, which predisposes them to accept incentives and to perceive pharmaceutical promotion as something normal within the profession. This early socialization, added to the lack of university regulations on the subject, favors a positive attitude towards pharmaceutical advertising in professional practice.

The findings reveal that drug advertising has a negative impact on the healthcare system, as it promotes overprescription, skews clinical decision-making and generates conflicts of interest. Despite this evidence, many doctors do not recognize the influence of industry incentives on their professional conduct. For this reason, the need to reform medical education to include more critical training on the

relationship between the pharmaceutical industry and health professionals is emphasized. Furthermore, bioethical analysis concludes that any external pressure that undermines or modifies medical decision-making is unacceptable, and even more so when it violates the principle of patient beneficence.

Finally, in this issue we present two current and relevant reviews.

The first, by Dr. Cabrera and Dr. Arce, highlights how advanced technology and critical medical decisions in internal medicine units generate constant ethical challenges that require the application of general bioethical principles to be addressed. For this reason, the authors conclude that it is necessary to promote reflection on the ethical responsibility of healthcare personnel and the relevance of ethics training in intensive medicine, as well as the need for clear and effective communication in the care of critical patients.

Finally, the review of the master Jovani confronts us with one of the most important epistemic foundations of the formation of bioethical knowledge, which is truth and its importance in our lives.

Reviewing the book *Biografía de la verdad* by Dr. Hurtado, the author highlights the need for an ethical education that values truth not only as a logical concept, but as a reality that influences human life. In bioethics, this implies the application of principles such as justice and responsible autonomy, ensuring that medical decisions are based on the concrete experience of patients and not on merely theoretical criteria.

Finally, the review highlights Dr. Hurtado's argument that truth and good should be understood as interdependent concepts and affirms that in the field of bioethics, decisions should reflect the lived reality of people and not only abstract principles; in other words, the analysis should be based on the unique experience of each agent involved.

*Dr. María Elizabeth de los Ríos Uriarte*

*Editor in charge*

*Universidad Anáhuac México, Facultad de Bioética, México*

<https://orcid.org/000000019600445X>