

NST2BBS
Natural Sciences Tripos Part II: Biological and Biomedical Sciences

Friday 7 June 2019

09.00–12.00

Paper 45

Philosophy and Ethics of Medicine

*You should answer **four** questions in total. Answer **at least one** question from Section A and **at least one** question from Section B. All questions carry equal weighting.*

Begin each answer on a separate sheet.

*Write legibly and on only **one** side of the paper.*

Answers must be tied up in separate bundles, marked 1, 2, 3, etc. according to the number of the question.

*Attach a completed coversheet to each bundle and complete a master coversheet listing all questions attempted. It is essential that you write your examination number and **not** your name on the coversheet and on **each** bundle.*

You may not start to read the questions printed on the subsequent pages of this question paper until instructed to do so by the invigilator.

SECTION A: Philosophy of Medicine

1. What role, if any, should social values play in ascriptions of health and disease?
2. Is there anything special about evidence from randomised control trials, as opposed to other forms of evidence?
3. Does it matter whether we use frequentist or Bayesian statistics to analyse clinical trials? If so, which should we use?
4. How should we decide whom to screen for medical conditions?
5. What is the greatest obstacle to measuring overall health states? Can it be overcome, either in theory or in practice?
6. Is using the Quality Adjusted Life Year in cost-effectiveness analysis for the distribution of limited healthcare resources fair? Why or why not?

SECTION B: Ethics of Medicine

7. Are there any morally salient differences between Pronuclear Transfer (PNT) and Maternal Spindle Transfer (MST)?
8. Does the symbolic value of human embryos impose ethical constraints on how they should be treated?
9. If I consent to the removal of tissue, do I thereby consent to the removal of an organ?
10. Should alcohol policy target “high risk” drinkers or “moderate” drinkers?
11. Critically assess Philip Kitcher’s arguments for “democratising” the research agenda.
12. Does the argument from inductive risk show that science cannot be objective?

END OF PAPER