Recent developments in prenatal genetic testing have also raised important questions. Since 2011, a new non-invasive prenatal test (NIPT) to screen for Down syndrome has been offered to pregnant women during the first trimester of pregnancy. Consisting of a simple maternal blood test, this is a more reliable technique that is safer for the fetus, and can be used earlier in pregnancy than the method previously used for this type of genetic screening. Some experts believe that these features, combined with the commercial interests backing the routinization of the NIPT, may put more pressure on women, who are left with the moral burden of deciding whether or not to accept the test, but are not always properly informed about this decision by medical staff.[[i]](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "m_8180782956259405939__edn1" \o ") Moreover, the number of conditions that can be detected by the NIPT is continuallyincreasing, so that the test should soon be capable of offering a wide range of genetic information about the fetus. It is important to consider whether the ability to obtain an increased amount of genetic information about a fetus is a positive development, from both individual and societal perspectives. To what extent should we protect the right of pregnant women to choose not to be informed of the likelihood that their fetus has atypical genetic conditions? At the societal level, is it not possible that prenatal genetic screening encourages eugenics?
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